



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## XVIII.—SPENSER AND THE *MIROUR DE L'OMME*

It has been tacitly assumed that the *Mirour de l'Omme* lived only in its name (and even in that somewhat equivocally) until the discovery of the single extant manuscript in 1895. To suggest that the poem not only did not die when it was born, but that on the contrary it was well known to Spenser, and that it gave to the *Faerie Queene* one of its most famous purple patches—such a suggestion, one may readily grant, would occur offhand to no one. Yet there is weighty evidence in support of just this contention, and that evidence it is the object of this paper to present. That the case is one which challenges somewhat sharply our established preconceptions, and that it must rest on firm ground to command assent, I am thoroughly aware.

### I

In the fourth canto of the first book of the *Faerie Queene* occurs the brilliant description of the progress of Pride, in a chariot drawn by the beasts on which are mounted the other six Deadly Sins. It is vividly pictorial in its effect, with its details sharply visualized in Spenser's most characteristic vein. Dealing as it does with one of the most conventional of all mediaeval themes, its warp, of course, is made up in part of the familiar commonplaces. But the pattern is strongly individual; in certain striking details the passage stands alone and unmatched among the hitherto noted literary treatments of the Seven Deadly Sins. That, to be sure, is in large measure due to the fact that it is Spenser who this time

is treating them. But nothing is more characteristic of Spenser than his weaving together, into a fabric peculiarly his own, of borrowed strands. For his imagination (it is clear) was exquisitely sensitive to suggestion, and when he imagines most vividly the initial stimulus is seldom far to seek. In a word—and though a paradox, his practice gives it proof—when he is most original we have fullest warrant for suspecting some antecedent influence that has sprung his imagination with a word or phrase or, particularly, with a hint of pictorial possibilities. But no source of what is thus peculiarly Spenserian in the great progress of the Seven Deadly Sins has yet been found.

The traits which combine to give the description its distinctive character may be readily summarized. In the first place, to the device of representing each Sin as riding on a symbolic animal Spenser has added the further symbolizing touch of depicting each Vice as holding an appropriate object in its hand. Second, with each of the six Sins thus pictured he has associated a specific malady (in the case of Wrath, a number of maladies). And finally, he has elaborated each portrait by a massing of vividly pictorial or sharply characterizing details. I wish to point out that in the description of the marriage of Pride and the World in the *Mirour de l'Omme* Gower represents each of the Sins as riding on a symbolic beast, and also as carrying an appropriate object in its hand; that in the fuller account of the Sins which follows he associates each with a specific malady; and that a very large number of Spenser's most strongly visualized details are present (though less closely focussed) in Gower. And finally, it will be seen that the correspondences are not only general, but in many cases definitely verbal. In no other treatment of the Seven Deadly Sins, so far as I

know, does the same combination of salient details occur. And the verbal parallels, taken in conjunction with this fact, seem to point to but one conclusion.

The passage in the *Mirour* with which we are first concerned is the section beginning at line 841, with the rubric: "Comment les sept files du Pecché vindront vers leur mariage, et de leur arrai et de leur chiere." For purposes of immediate comparison I shall quote it in full. The corresponding stanzas in Spenser<sup>2</sup> are readily accessible, and it is assumed that they will be before the reader.

Chascune soer endroit du soy  
 L'un apres l'autre ove son conroi  
 Vint en sa guise noblement,  
 Enchivalchant par grant desroy;  
 Mais ce n'estoit sur palefroy,  
 Ne sur les mules d'orient:  
 Orguil qui vint primerement  
 S'estoit monté moult fierement  
 Sur un lioun, q'aler en coy  
 Ne volt pour nul chastiment, 850  
 Ainz salt sur la menue gent,  
 Du qui tous furent en effroy.

Du selle et frein quoy vous dirray,  
 Du mantellet ou d'autre array?  
 Trestout fuist plain du queinterie;  
 Car unques prée flouriz en mail  
 N'estoit au regarder si gay  
 Des fleurs, comme ce fuist du perrie:  
 Et sur son destre poign saisie  
 Une aigle avoit, que signifie 860  
 Qu'il trestous autres a l'essay  
 Volt surmonter de s'estutye.  
 Ensi vint a la reverie  
 La dame dont parlé vous ay.  
 Puis vint Envyé en son degré,  
 Q'estoit desur un chien monté,  
 Et sur son destre poign portoit

<sup>2</sup> *F. Q.*, I, iv, 17-35.

Un espervier q'estoit mué:  
 La face ot moult descolouré  
 Et pale des mals que pensoit, 870  
 Et son mantell dont s'affoubloit  
 Du purpre au droit devis estoit  
 Ove cuers ardans bien enbroudé,  
 Et entre d'eux, qui bien seoit,  
 Du serpent langues y avoit  
 Par tout menuement proudré.

Après Envye vint suiant  
 Sa soer dame Ire enchivalchant  
 Moult fierement sur un sengler,  
 Et sur son poign un cock portant. 880  
 Soulaine vint, car attendant  
 Avoit ne sergant n'escuier;  
 La cote avoit du fin acier,  
 Et des culteals plus d'un millier  
 Q'au coste luy furent pendant:  
 Trop fuist la dame a redouter,  
 Tous s'en fuient de son sentier,  
 Et la lessont passer avant.

Dessus un asne lent et lass  
 Enchivalchant le petit pass 890  
 Puis vint Accidie loign derere,  
 Et sur son poign pour son solas  
 Tint un huan ferm par un las:  
 Si ot toutdis pres sa costiere  
 Sa couche faite en sa litiere;  
 N'estoit du merriem ne de piere,  
 Ainz fuist de plom de halt en bass.  
 Si vint au feste en tieu maniere,  
 Mais aulques fuist de mate chere,  
 Pour ce q'assetz ne dormi pas.

Dame Avarice apres cela  
 Vint vers le feste et chivalcha  
 Sur un baucan qui voit toutdis  
 Devers la terre, et pour cela  
 Nulle autre beste tant prisas:  
 Si ot sur l'un des poigns assis  
 Un ostour qui s'en vait toutdis  
 Pour proye, et dessus l'autre ot mis  
 Un merlot q'en larcine va.

Des bources portoit plus que dis, 910  
 Que tout de l'orr sont replenis:  
 Moult fuist l'onour q'om le porta.

Bien tost apres il me sovient  
 Que dame Gloutonie vient,  
 Que sur le lou s'est chivalché,  
 Et sur son poign un coufle tient,  
 Q'a sa nature bien avient;  
 Si fist porter pres sa costée  
 Beau cop de vin envessellé:  
 N'ot guaire deux pass chivalchée, 920  
 Quant Yveresce luy survient,  
 Saisist le frein, si l'ad mené,  
 Et dist de son droit heritée  
 Ques cel office a luy partient.

Puis vi venir du queinte atour  
 La dame q'ad fait maint fol tour,  
 C'est Leccherie la plus queinte:  
 En un manteal de fol amour  
 Sist sur le chievre q'est lechour,  
 En qui luxure n'est restreinte. 930  
 Et sur son poign soutz sa constreinte  
 Porte un colomb; dont meinte et meinte  
 Pour l'aguarder s'en vont entour.  
 Du beal colour la face ot peinte,  
 Oels vairs riantz, dont mainte enpeinte  
 Ruoit au fole gent entour.

Et d'autre part sans nul demeure  
 Le Siecle vint en mesme l'eure,  
 Et c'estoit en le temps joly  
 Du Maii, quant la deesce Nature 940  
 Bois, champs et préés de sa verdure  
 Reveste, et l'oisel font leur cry,  
 Chantant deinz ce buisson flori,  
 Que point l'amie ove son amy:  
 Lors cils que vous nomay desseure  
 Les noces font, comme je vous dy:  
 Moult furont richement servy  
 Sanz point, sanz reule et sanz mesure.\*

\* *The Complete Works of John Gower*, ed. G. C. Macaulay, Oxford, 1899, Vol. I, pp. 13-14.

Certain divergences between the two accounts may at once be given their due weight. In the first place, the *order* of the Sins is not the same. The succession in Spenser is Pride, Idleness, Gluttony, Lechery, Avarice, Envy, Wrath. In Gower the order is the more conventional one—Pride, Envy, Wrath, Idleness, Avarice, Gluttony, Lechery.<sup>4</sup> But the difference in arrangement has no significance. The order in the *Assembly of Gods*<sup>5</sup> is Pride, Envy, Wrath, Avarice, Gluttony, Lechery, Idleness. In *Piers the Plowman* (Passus v) the series is Pride, [Lechery], Envy, Wrath, Lechery, Avarice, Gluttony, Idleness.<sup>6</sup> And other variations are numerous.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Dante, *Purgatorio*; *Cursor Mundi* (Book of Penance); *Kalender of Shepherdes*; Chaucer, *Parson's Tale*; etc. Except that Wrath and Envy are interchanged, this is also the order in *Handlyng Synne*, as it is likewise (with the interchange of Gluttony and Lechery) in the *Ayenbite of Inwyrt* and *Le Mireour du Monde*.

<sup>5</sup> Professor MacCracken's rejection of the poem as Lydgate's seems to be warranted by the evidence. See *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate* (E. E. T. S., 1911), pp. xxxv-vi.

<sup>6</sup> In Passus II, 79 ff., Lechery and Avarice are interchanged.

<sup>7</sup> In the *Cursor Mundi* (Castle of Love) the order is Pride, Envy, Gluttony, Lechery, Avarice, Wrath, Idleness. In the *Lay Folk's Catechism* it is Pride, Envy, Wrath, Gluttony, Avarice, Idleness, Lechery; in Mirk's *Instructions for Parish Priests*, Pride, Idleness, Envy, Wrath, Avarice, Gluttony, Lechery; in the *Castle of Perseverance*, Avarice, Pride, Wrath, Envy, Lechery, Gluttony (the last two interchanged when the Sins actually appear); in *Nature*, Pride, Avarice, Wrath, Envy, Gluttony, Idleness, Lechery; in Dunbar, Pride, Wrath, Envy, "Sweirnes" (= Idleness), Lechery (with Idleness), Gluttony. See further Professor Tupper's article on "Chaucer and the Seven Deadly Sins" (*Publications of the Modern Language Association*, xxix, March, 1914), p. 94, especially note 1. Professor Tupper's statement that "in all lists, however, Pride is the first of the sins," is not quite correct. See the order in the *Castle of Perseverance* above (where Pride is second), and compare de Deguileville, *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man* (E. E. T. S., pp. 316 ff.), where the order is [Idleness], Gluttony, Lechery (under the guise of Venus), Sloth, *Pride*, Envy, Wrath, Avarice.

No valid conclusion, accordingly, may be drawn from this particular divergence. The *sex* of the Sins, moreover, is different in the two accounts. In the *Mirour* all seven are the daughters of Sin and Death; in the *Faerie Queene* Pride is a "mayden Queene," the others—her "six sage Counsellours"—are masculine. But the sex of the Sins is inherent in the fundamental plan of Gower's poem; the divergence in Spenser grows out of his conception of the House of Pride, and is susceptible of interpretation as representing a perfectly familiar mode of adapting borrowed material. The same may be said of the fact that in Gower the Sins ride in procession single file, while in Spenser they ride, apparently, side by side.<sup>8</sup> Inasmuch as Gower's plan demands at this point a bridal procession, Spenser's a chariot drawn by a team, the difference in detail is again inherent in the difference in plan. In a word, the divergences are either without significance (as in the case of the order of treatment), or else they grow out of the different settings of the situation in the two poems, and are so without real bearing on the point at issue.

It is likenesses, however, with which we are most concerned. And, quite apart from details, the similarities between the two descriptions both in general conception and even in method are obvious—so obvious, indeed, as to constitute in themselves (especially after even a cursory survey of the other treatments of the Seven Deadly Sins)

<sup>8</sup> Spenser's picture here is not clear at a glance. The "six un-equall beasts" on which the Sins ride draw the chariot of Pride. Idleness is spoken of as "the first," and is represented as having "guiding of the way," while Gluttony rides "by his side." Lechery rides "next to him," Avarice, "by him"; Envy, "next to him," Wrath, "him beside." The alternation of "next to him" with "by his side," "by him," "him beside," seems to point to a procession two and two.



a strong piece of presumptive evidence. For in Gower's concrete and definitely visualized imagery are precisely the elements on which Spenser's imagination was wont to seize for transmutation in his own alembic, and the lines in the *Faerie Queene* stand to those in the *Mirour* in a relation strikingly similar to that which other well known passages in Spenser bear to Ariosto.<sup>9</sup>

But such evidence can at best be merely presumptive, and the general parallel, however striking, is inconclusive. It is necessary to examine closely the details. And it will

\* See, in particular, Professor R. E. Neil Dodge's illuminating discussion of "Spenser's Imitations from Ariosto," in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XII (1897), pp. 151-204. Professor Dodge's brief summary may be quoted here, for it is highly pertinent to this discussion: "When he copies Ariosto it is almost always with a change. He may take the facts of a plot one by one as they stand in his original; the peculiar rendering will always be his own. He may adopt a situation—it will be with certain modifications which alter its character. He may imitate a reflective passage—the spirit of the version will be new" (p. 196). Compare p. 197: "Every passage borrowed might be recast, modified, animated with another spirit," etc. Of all this Professor Dodge's article itself gives ample illustration. Two more recent statements bearing on Spenser's methods of borrowing and adapting may be cited. The first is from an article by Professor E. A. Hall ("Spenser and Two Old French Grail Romances") in the same *Publications*, Vol. XXVIII (Dec., 1913): "The acceptance of the variations as Spenser's own contribution to the episode . . . does not require the embarrassing qualification that the poet has in this instance handled source material in a manner differing in any respect from his recognized method. Everywhere in Spenser we find borrowed matter, sometimes from one source, sometimes from two or more sources, combined with the stuff of the poet's own fancy after the fashion of a patchwork quilt, but in a pattern superior to any of his originals," etc. (pp. 542-43). Compare also Professor Reed Smith's study (*Modern Language Notes*, Vol. XXVIII, March, 1913, pp. 82-85) of "The *Metamorphoses* in *Muioptomos*," especially the remarks on Spenser's method of borrowing (Note 5, p. 84).

simplify matters to present the more salient facts in tabular form.

Sin.	Beast.		Object carried.		Malady.	
	Gower	Spenser	Gower	Spenser	Gower	Spenser
[Pride]	lion		eagle	mirror	frenzy <sup>11</sup>	
Idleness (3) <sup>10</sup>	ass	ass	owl	breviary	lethargy	fever
Gluttony (5)	wolf	swine	kite (+ vessel of wine)	bouzing can	"loup roial"	dropsy
Lechery (6)	goat	goat	dove	burning heart	leprosy	pox (?)
Avarice (4)	horse	camel	hawk (+ "bources")	[gold]	dropsy	gout
Envy (1)	dog	wolf	sparrow- hawk	[toad]	fever ("ethike")	leprosy
Wrath (2)	bear	lion	cock	burning brand	cardiacle	spleen, palsy, etc.

It should be kept in mind that the essential correspondence in the two accounts, so far as the facts of the table are concerned, is the striking conjunction in both of symbolic animals, symbolic objects carried in the hand, and symbolic maladies. That both beasts and objects (leaving for the moment the maladies out of account) should vary, is to be expected, when a greater artist is dealing with the symbolism. But even so the direct correspondences are closer than at first appears. Idleness in Spenser rides "upon a *slouthfull Asse*";<sup>12</sup> in Gower it is "*dessur un asne lent et lass.*"<sup>13</sup> And

<sup>10</sup> The order of the Sins is that in Spenser. The figure in parenthesis represents the place of the Sin in Gower's order.

<sup>11</sup> For the references in the case of the maladies see below, p. 408.

<sup>12</sup> St. XVIII, l. 7. Hereafter, in giving the references to Spenser, the Roman numeral will indicate the stanza; the Arabic, the line.

<sup>13</sup> L. 889. But compare also the "*dull asse*" in the *Assembly of Gods* below, p. 398.

"his heavie hedd" <sup>14</sup> corresponds to "de mate chere." <sup>15</sup> Gluttony's "bouzing can" <sup>16</sup> is in Gower as the "beau cop de vin envessellé." <sup>17</sup> Lechery in Gower rides "sur le chievre *q'est lecchour*"; <sup>18</sup> in Spenser he rides upon "a bearded Gote, whose rugged heare . . . *was like the person selfe whom he did beare.*" <sup>19</sup> The "burning hart" which he bears in his hand takes the place of the dove, and is not in Gower's description of Lechery. But it is in his account of Envy, as the "cuers ardans" of l 73. Avarice in Gower "*des bources portoit plus que dis, Que tout de l'orr sont replenis.*" <sup>20</sup> In Spenser, "two iron coffers hung on either side, *With precious metal full as they might hold.*" <sup>21</sup> Envy's kirtle in Spenser is "of discolourd say"; <sup>22</sup> in Gower, Envy's face is "moult descolouré." <sup>23</sup> This kirtle in Spenser is "*ypaynted full of eies*"; <sup>24</sup> in Gower "*son mantell dont s'affoubloit* [compare Spenser's "all in a kirtle . . . *he clothed was*"] Du purpre au droit devis estoit *Ove cuers ardans bien enbroudé.*" <sup>25</sup> The burning hearts have been transferred to Lechery; the eyes more fittingly (cf. xxx, 7; xxxi, 6) take their place. In Envy's bosom, in Spenser, lies "an hatefull Snake"; <sup>26</sup> in Gower, between the burning hearts are scattered serpents' tongues. <sup>27</sup> To Wrath's dagger correspond "des culteals" in Gower. <sup>28</sup> I grant at

<sup>14</sup> XIX, 5.<sup>15</sup> L. 899.<sup>16</sup> XXII, 6.<sup>17</sup> L. 919. See also below, p. 415.<sup>18</sup> L. 929.<sup>19</sup> XXIV, 2, 4.<sup>20</sup> Ll. 910-11.<sup>21</sup> XXVII, 3-4. See also below, p. 424, n. 49.<sup>22</sup> XXXI, 1.

<sup>23</sup> L. 869. Envy is also "megre, pale and lene, *Dyscolouryd*" ("*descoloree*" in the French text of *Le Romant des trois pelerinages*) in de Deguileville (E. E. T. S., p. 401, ll. 14867-68). Too much stress, accordingly, may not be laid on this detail.

<sup>24</sup> XXXI, 2.<sup>25</sup> Ll. 871-73.<sup>26</sup> XXXI, 3-4.<sup>27</sup> Ll. 874-76. Compare also below, pp. 436, 442, 446.<sup>28</sup> L. 884.



	Gower	Spenser	<i>Assembly</i>	<i>Ancrén Riwole</i>
Pride	lion	—	lion	lion
Idleness	ass	ass	ass	bear
Gluttony	wolf	swine	bear	sow
Lechery	goat	goat	goat	scorpion
Avarice	horse	camel	elephant	fox
Envy	dog	wolf	wolf	adder
Wrath	boar	lion	boar	unicorn

Spenser agrees with Gower in four out of the seven animals, and in two cases (those of Idleness and Lechery) the association of the animal and the Vice corresponds.<sup>32</sup> The *change* in the case of the *lion*, moreover, is no less significant than the agreement. Wrath in Gower rides upon a boar; in Spenser he is mounted on a lion. Now in the *Mirour* it is Pride who is borne by a lion. In the *Fairie Queene*, however, Pride is in the chariot drawn by the remaining Sins, so that her lion is available for other use. And it is difficult to doubt that it is from Pride in the *Mirour* that Spenser has transferred the lion to his own Wrath. For Gower's description is at once uncommonly pictorial and apt: "un lioun, q'aler en coy

<sup>32</sup> It is at least possible that the author of the *Assembly* may have known Gower's account. At all events the two passages agree in five out of the seven animals, and in four cases (those of Pride, Idleness, Lechery, and Wrath) the assignment of animals to vices corresponds. It is of course further possible that Spenser may have known the procession in the *Assembly*. He agrees with it in four of the seven animals, and in three cases (those of Idleness, Lechery, and Envy) the conjunction of animal and vice is identical. But the crucial test of the combination in one account of animals, objects, and maladies—quite apart from verbal agreements—throws the procession in the *Assembly* decisively out of court, except as a possible subsidiary source.

*Ne volt pour nul chastiment, Ainz salt sur la menue gent, Du qui tous furont en effroy.*" <sup>33</sup> And it is precisely this distinctive touch <sup>34</sup> which appears condensed in Spenser's phrase: "Upon a Lion, *loth for to be led.*" <sup>35</sup> As for the other three changes, one can perhaps only guess. But the swine (associated with Gluttony in both the *Ancren Riwe* and the *Ayenbite of Inwyte*) is obviously more in keeping with the superb grossness of Spenser's conception of Gluttony than the wolf, and the wolf, thus available for other use, may readily have been transferred (possibly under the influence of the *Assembly*) to Envy, to whose malicious and devastating character, as Spenser conceives it, it is certainly more appropriate than the dog. Spenser's choice of the camel for Avarice will be discussed below; <sup>36</sup> and Gower's rather inept assignment of the horse cried out in any case for the reviser's hand.

The changes in the objects carried—once the idea of such objects was suggested—are again what we should expect. Gower's symbolism is general; the object chosen—in each case a bird (with the addition, in the case of Gluttony and Avarice, of two objects *which also appear in Spenser*) <sup>37</sup>—is broadly appropriate to the Vice, rather than an integral part of a description conceived and executed as an artistic whole. In Spenser, on the other hand, the objects—in no case a bird—are part and parcel of a *composition*; as in Gower, they have a symbolic relation to the Vice, but they also blend with the other details to create a unified impression. Their choice, in other words, is determined not only by their symbolic, but also

<sup>33</sup> Ll. 849-52.

<sup>34</sup> Compare, for instance, the conventional "roaring lion" of the procession in the *Assembly*.

<sup>35</sup> XXXIII, 2.

<sup>36</sup> See p. 424.

<sup>37</sup> See above, p. 396; below, pp. 415, 424.

by their artistic value. Thus the conception of Idleness is dominated by the religious aspect of Somnolence, and the unused breviary—instead of an owl "*pour son solas*"—is completely in harmony with that. Gluttony's "*bouzing can*" (with its suggestion in Gower) follows inevitably from the rest of the description; the kite, however apposite to the Vice *per se*, would be extraneous to the composition. Lechery's burning heart (the hint for which is also found in Gower) and Wrath's burning brand are organically symbolic—they grow out of their respective conceptions and at the same time focus them; the dove and the cock in Spenser's setting would strike a discordant note. And this more organic treatment is carried one step farther in the case of Avarice and Envy, whose hands are occupied, in the one case with telling the gold, in the other with holding the toad. In either description the bird would be a mere mechanical device. Once more, given on the one hand the apt suggestion of a symbolizing object, given on the other Spenser's gift for composing—for harmonizing descriptive details into organic unity—and the naïve symbolism of Gower's birds would inevitably give place to emblems of a subtler sort.

One may, however, agree that Spenser *would* have done thus or so, and yet be unconvinced that he *did* just these things—that the case, after all, is anything but hypothetical. Let us see, accordingly, if there are other indications that point more directly toward borrowing on Spenser's part. We have so far left Pride out of the reckoning. She must, however, be brought into the account.<sup>38</sup> In the

<sup>38</sup> In both passages Pride is a woman. And in Gower, as in Spenser, she is set off sharply from the other Sins. Not only is she represented as their leader ("*Orguil, des autres capiteine,*" l. 1045)—a distinction which is of course a commonplace of commonplaces—but the pomp and circumstance of the marriage centers about her.

*Faerie Queene* her position in the chariot takes her out of the procession of four-footed beasts, but it does not deprive her of her symbolic object. In Gower the bird is—fittingly enough—an eagle. But Spenser's symbolism is once more *inherent*:

And in her hand she held a mirrhour bright,  
Wherein her face she often vewed fayne,  
And in her selfe-lov'd semblance took delight.<sup>39</sup>

The significance of the emblem in the *Mirour*, however, is retained in the *Faerie Queene*. The eagle in Gower “signefie Qu'il trestous autres a l'essay Volt surmonter de s'estutye.”<sup>40</sup> Spenser remarks of Pride:

For to the highest she did still aspyre,  
Or, if ought higher were than that, did it desyre.<sup>41</sup>

When the Redcrosse Knight and Duessa have made obeisance to Pride “on humble knee,”

With loftie eyes, halfe loth to looke so lowe,  
She thancked them in her disdainfull wise;  
Ne other grace vouchsafed them to showe.<sup>42</sup>

So in the *Mirour*:

*Desdaign, quant passe aval la rue,  
Par fier regard les oels il rue*

---

<sup>39</sup> x, 6-8. Pride in the *Pilgrimage* also

Held a large merour in hyr hond,  
Hyr owgly fletuyrs to behold and se (ll. 14002-03).

In the *Pelerinage*:

Et vng mirouer luy tenoit  
Afin que dedans regardast  
Et que sa face elle y mirast. (*Romant*, f. xlviij).

But the fitness of detail is sufficiently obvious in any case.

<sup>40</sup> Ll. 860-61.

<sup>41</sup> xi, 8-9.

<sup>42</sup> xiv, 1-3.



*Dessur les povres gens menuz . . .  
Que ne respont a leur saluz.<sup>43</sup>*

Pride's chariot is

*Adorned all with gold and girlonds gay,  
That seemed as fresh as Flora in her prime.<sup>44</sup>*

Orguil's saddle and bridle are

*Trestout . . . plain du queinterie;  
Car unques prée flouriz en maii  
N'estoit au reguarder si gay  
Des fleurs, comme ce fuist du perrie.<sup>45</sup>*

Moreover, Spenser gives Pride (so far as I know) a unique parentage:

*Of griesly Pluto she the daughter was,  
And sad Proserpina, the Queene of hell.<sup>46</sup>*

---

<sup>43</sup> Ll. 2257-59, 2262. These lines are from a direrent portion of the *Mirour*, where Pride is dealt with in detail. The significance of this fact will appear later (see below, sec. II). Todd properly refers "with loftie eyes" to Prov. xxx, 13. But Gower translates Prov. xxx, 13 a few lines below:

*De celle generacioun  
Portant les oels d'elacioun  
Ove la palpebre en halt assise,  
Que ja d'umiliacioun  
Ne prent consideracioun (ll. 2293-97).*

The verse reads in the Vulgate: "Generatio cujus excelsi sunt oculi, et palpebrae ejus in alta surrectae."

<sup>44</sup> xvii, 2-3.

<sup>45</sup> Ll. 855-58.

<sup>46</sup> xi, 1-2. In the very remarkable account of the coronation of Pride in the thirteenth-century *Renart-le-Nouvel* of Jacquemars Gielée (text in *Le Roman du Renart*, ed. Méon, Paris, 1826, Vol. iv, pp. 125 ff.; see also *Renart-le-Nouvel*, ed. Houdoy, Paris, 1874) Proserpine is the mistress of Orguel:

*K'envoïé li ot Proserpine  
Del puc d'Infier, c'or d'amor fine  
Amoït Orguel et Orgeus li,*

Her descent in Gower (where she is the daughter of Sin and Death) is different, but in the very next section of the *Mirour*, in the account of the marriage of Pride and the World,<sup>47</sup> three lines after the mention of her parentage we read:

Au table q'estoit principal  
*Pluto d'enfern Imperial*  
*Ove Proserpine s'asseoit.*<sup>48</sup>

And immediately there follows an account of the feasting at the wedding which concerns us nearly:

Dont fuist leur *feste et joye* maire . . .<sup>49</sup>  
 Mais pour servir d'especial  
*Bachus la sale* ministroit,  
 Et Venus plus avant servoit  
*Toutes les chambres* del hostal.<sup>50</sup>

So in Spenser, after "the solace of the open aire,"

That night they pas in *joy and jollity*,  
*Feasting and courting* both in *bowre and hall*.<sup>51</sup>

The ministrations of Bacchus and Venus correspond

Mais à Pluto pas n'abieli,  
 Car il en fu en jalousie (ll. 233-37).

In this account Pride is masculine, and the other six Sins are "sis Dames" (ll. 1173 ff.), who come to meet Pride two by two, but "à pie" (l. 1181), in the order Wrath and Envy, Avarice and Idleness, Luxury and Gluttony. But there are no farther parallels. See ll. 1172-1247. Pluto and Proserpine also appear (together with Jupiter, Saturn, Apollo, Mercury, Neptune, and Mars) in *Le Tornoient de l'Antechrist* (p. 18), but in no immediate connection with Pride.

<sup>47</sup> "Coment lez sept files du Pecché furent espousez au Siecle, des quelles la primere ot a noun dame Orguil."

<sup>48</sup> Ll. 961-63.

<sup>49</sup> Compare, in the same account, "Del tiel *revel*, del tiele *joye*" (l. 999).

<sup>50</sup> Ll. 960, 969-72.

<sup>51</sup> XLIII, 5-6.

exactly to "feasting and courting,"<sup>52</sup> and "bowre and hall" (like "joy and jollity") are verbally carried over. But that is not the only verbal correspondence. Bacchus and Venus would scarcely fit at this point into Spenser's scheme, along with Sansfoy and Duessa. They are not, however, the only ones who serve at Pride's wedding. Thirteen lines farther on occurs the following:

*Lors Gloutonie a grant mesure  
Du large main mettoit sa cure  
As grans hanaps du vin emplir.*<sup>53</sup>

The next lines in Spenser are as follows:

*For Steward was excessive Gluttony,  
That of his plenty poured forth to all.*

But even that is not all. For Spenser has apparently remembered an earlier summary of the Sins in the *Mirour*, and with his close paraphrase of Gower's three lines in the account of the marriage on which he is freely drawing, *he has interwoven the very phraseology of the earlier passage*:

*Accidie estoit son chamberer,  
Et Glotonie de son droit  
Estoit son maistre boteller.*<sup>54</sup>

*For Steward was excessive Gluttony,  
That of his plenty poured forth to all;  
Which doen, the Chamberlain, Slowth, did to  
rest them call.*<sup>55</sup>

We shall have abundant evidence later of the same sort of selection and dexterous combination on Spenser's part.

<sup>52</sup> So far as "courting" is concerned, see further ll. 981-83:

*Car mainte delitable geste  
Leur dist, dont il les cuers entice  
Des jofnes dames au delice.*

And compare ll. 1009-20, 1045-56.

<sup>53</sup> Ll. 985-87.

<sup>54</sup> Ll. 296-98.

<sup>55</sup> XLIII, 7-9

But even were that not so, the last five lines of the forty-third stanza put the burden of proof on the *denial* of his borrowing. And it will be observed that it is precisely the same sort of readjustment for his own purposes (in this case *demonstrable*) which we have seen (where it was more a matter of *assumption*) in the case of the animals and the birds.

Nor does this exhaust the parallels in the stanzas immediately following the account of the Progress. In Spenser,

. . . after all, upon the wagon beame,  
Rode Sathan with a smarting whip in hand,  
With which he forward lasht the laesy teme.<sup>56</sup>

In Gower, the lines that immediately follow *his* account of the procession are these:

As noces de si hault affaire  
*Ly deables* ce q'estoit a faire  
*Tout ordena par son devis.*<sup>57</sup>

To the "huge routs of people [that] did *about them* band" in Spenser (xxxvi, 5) corresponds the "*fole gent entour*" (l. 936) and "*la menue gent*" (l. 851) on which Pride's lion leaps in Gower. The "*fresh flowering fields*" in which Spenser's company sports (xxxvii, 3) are paralleled by the "*champs et prées de sa verdure Reveste*" and the "*buisson flori*" (ll. 941-43) which give the setting of the procession in the *Mirour*.<sup>58</sup> Instinctive prepossessions aside, the evidence seems clear that Spenser has done with Gower what we know that he did with Ariosto

<sup>56</sup> xxxvi, 1-3.

<sup>57</sup> Ll. 949-51.

<sup>58</sup> The two lines, moreover, which close the account of the feast in Gower correspond word for word with a line in one of the earlier stanzas in Spenser which likewise describe the House of Pride:

Et pour solempnement tenir

and Tasso, with Ovid and Chaucer and the romances. Even on the ground of the facts so far before us, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the entire fourth canto is an amazing piece of marquetry—that in its composition Spenser characteristically culled and dovetailed as he wrote. The importance in particular of just this group of parallels that involve the *background* of the two accounts is obvious. For they are entirely independent of the treatment of the Seven Deadly Sins as such. They constitute, that is, a *differentia* of this particular treatment, and this *differentia* of Gower's account appears in Spenser too.<sup>58a</sup> And the way in which not only the description of the procession in Gower (of which there is still much more to say), but also his account of the feast, is inlaid (unless I much mistake) in Spenser's own narrative " [speaks] the praises of the workman's witt" no less than the "goodly heape" of the House of Pride itself.

The consideration of Pride and "of the feste that was at hir weddinge" has withdrawn our attention from Spen-

---

Le feste, a toute gent ovrir  
 Les portes ffront a toute hure (ll. 994-96).

Arrived there, they passed in forth right;  
 For still to all the gates stood open wide (vi, 1-2).

"Still" = *a toute hure*; "to all" = *a toute gent*; "the gates" = *Les portes*; "stood open" = *ovrir . . . ffront*. The only word in Spenser's line (barring "For") which does not literally translate a corresponding word or phrase in Gower is the rhyme-word "wide." But striking as the verbal identity is, it is possible that in this case the two poets are simply expressing a very common idea in the obvious words, and that the correspondence is accidental. It would certainly have no value whatever were it an isolated parallel. Standing as it does, however, in immediate connection with a number of other close parallels too numerous and too remarkable to be safely regarded as coincidences, this line too is very possibly an instance of verbal memory on Spenser's part.

<sup>58a</sup> See especially below, p. 449.

ser's treatment of the other six Sins, and to that we may now return. I have said that, in both Spenser and Gower, each Sin is associated with a definite malady. This association, in Gower, occurs in the elaborate exposition of the Seven Sins which immediately follows the account of the marriage of Pride. And it appears in each case as a part of the final summarizing section.<sup>59</sup> In Spenser, too, it serves, in each instance, as the final characterizing detail. I shall repeat the tabular view, so far as it includes the maladies:

	Gower	Spenser
Pride	frenzy <sup>60</sup>	—
Idleness	lethargy <sup>61</sup>	fever
Gluttony	loup roial <sup>62</sup>	dropsy
Lechery	leprosy <sup>63</sup>	pox
Avarice	dropsy <sup>64</sup>	gout
Envy	fever <sup>65</sup>	leprosy
Wrath	cardiacle <sup>66</sup>	spleen, palsy, &c.

The two lists have three of the seven diseases in common; in no instance, however, do Spenser and Gower associate the same malady with a given Sin. But once more, it is the common device which is the essential point. A different application, in Spenser's case, is what, *a priori*, we should expect. Some of the divergences—I think it is not difficult to see—are due (as in the case of the objects carried) to the necessities of the case, or to a finer sense of

<sup>59</sup> See below, pp. 410-11.

<sup>60</sup> Ll. 2525-32.

<sup>61</sup> Ll. 6157-68; cf. xx, 5-8.

<sup>62</sup> Ll. 8521-32; cf. xxiii, 6-8.

<sup>63</sup> Ll. 9637-72; cf. xxvi, 6-8.

<sup>64</sup> Ll. 7603-08; cf. xxix, 6-8.

<sup>65</sup> Ll. 3817-28; cf. xxxii, 8.

<sup>66</sup> Ll. 5093-5100; cf. xxxv, 7-8.

fitness.<sup>67</sup> But at least two (if not three) give evidence of having been suggested by Gower. The least significant may be briefly mentioned here. In the *Mirour* dropsy is associated with Avarice. In the *Faerie Queene* it is assigned to Gluttony. But that the one passage has suggested the other seems probable. Spenser's lines are as follows:

And a *dry* dropsie through his flesh did flow,  
Which by *misdiet* daily greater grew.<sup>68</sup>

Gower's lines are these:

Cil q'ad le mal d'idropesie,  
*Comme plus se prent a beverie,*  
*Tant plus du soif desnatural*  
*Ensecche.*<sup>69</sup>

The two agree not only in the idea of *thirst* (which is not remarkable),<sup>70</sup> but also in the emphasis on its increase

<sup>67</sup> Leprosy, with its medieval associations, is appropriate enough to Lechery. The change, however, to the unnamed but easily identified disease—

. . . that foule evill, which all men reprove,  
That rots the marrow, and consumes the braine—

was practically inevitable, after pox, as the accompaniment of lechery, had been defined and differentiated. Gout is a more realistic, more picturesque (if less conventionally symbolic) disease for Avarice than dropsy. On the other hand, the highly symbolic group of diseases—"The swelling Splene, and Frenzy raging rife, The shaking Palsey, and St. Fraunces fire"—form a striking climax to the long catalogue of mischiefs that follow Wrath; Gower's cardiacle (entirely appropriate in *fact*) would in this case have come in as an anticlimax. Indeed, the plan of this particular stanza (and that, as we have seen, is with Spenser a paramount consideration) excludes the treatment he has accorded the diseases in the other instances, where they prey upon the Sin itself.

<sup>68</sup> XXXIII, 7-8.

<sup>69</sup> Ll. 7603-06.

<sup>70</sup> "Signa autem hydropsis . . . sunt . . . *sitis inextinguibilis* (Bernardus Gordonius, *Lilium medicinae*, Particula VI, cap. v—

by what it feeds on. The case of Envy is particularly striking, but I shall reserve it (together with that of Idleness) for discussion below,<sup>71</sup> where the evidence becomes cumulative.

## II

Up to this point we have been concerned with the agreement of the two accounts in the threefold conjunction of animals, symbolic objects, and maladies—a conjunction without other parallel—and with the adroit interweaving of Gower's description of the wedding feast with Spenser's narrative. The divergences in detail (however accounted for) between the two lists of animals, objects, and maladies may be felt to deprive their agreement (however unique) of entire conclusiveness. On the other hand, the verbal borrowings in the dovetailed fragments of the festival seem to admit no alternative. And we have now to consider a mass of correspondences of a similar sort, which should go far, I think, to dispel any lingering doubts. The list is too long to give entire, and I shall select those details which are most significant. They involve especially the portraits of Gluttony, Envy, Avarice, Idleness, and Wrath.

Spenser's descriptions of the six Deadly Sins (excluding Pride) subsume, in each case, characteristics which are frequently, in other accounts, distributed among the various "branches" or "species" of the respective Sins. In Gower (in the long section of the *Mirour* that follows the recital

ed. 1550, p. 543); "Quantum [signum] est *sitis*" (Valescus de Taranta, *Philonium*, Lib. v, cap. 8—ed. 1526, f. ccliv). The older commentators misunderstood "dry," and Upton's emendation "dire dropsy" (see Warton's note in the 1805 *Variorum*) and Collier's "hydropsy" are of course unnecessary.

<sup>71</sup> See pp. 436, 428.



of the marriage of the seven Vices) this distribution is actually made between their progeny. Each Vice bears the World five children, and each of these is characterized at length. And each of the five accounts is followed by a section bearing the rubric: "La discripcioun d'Envie [Ire, etc.] proprement" (or "par especial"). What Spenser has done—if evidence has any meaning—is to draw freely for suggestion on these very detailed and often vivid "characters."<sup>1</sup> For the sake of brevity, I shall give the parallels, in what follows, with as little comment as possible.

It has long been recognized that Spenser's Gluttony is in part modelled on the classical descriptions of Bacchus and (especially) Silenus, and that Vergil, Ovid, Aristotle, and the Bible have contributed to the thoroughly Spenserian mosaic. I shall first give the evidence that certain details for which parallels have not hitherto been adduced are drawn from Gower, and then return to the lines which represent, in part at least, other influences.

With which he *swallowed up* excessive feast,  
For want whereof *poore people oft did pyne*.<sup>1a</sup>

. . . *ensi pour maintenir*  
*Sa guele il fait avant venir*  
*Ce q'est dedeinz le mesuage*  
*Des povres, dont se fait emplir:*

<sup>1</sup>It is not (be it said at once) that there are in the portraits only such traits as appear nowhere else. To suggest that Spenser knew the Seven Deadly Sins only through Gower would be a palpable absurdity. That he knew other treatments and remembered them, admits no doubt. On conventions common to both, then, I shall lay but little stress. But even where the traits that are common to the two poems are more or less conventional, it is obvious that they must be interpreted in the light of the massing of correspondences that are *not* mere conventions of the *genre*.

<sup>1a</sup> *XXI*, 6-7.

L'en doit tieu feste trop haïr  
 Dont l'autre plourent lour dammage.<sup>2</sup>

His *belly* was *upblowne* with luxury . . .  
 And all the way, *most like a brutish beast*,  
*He spued up his gorge, that all did him deteast.*<sup>3</sup>

Il porte d'omme l'estature,  
 Et est semblable de nature  
 Au chien, qant ad le ventre enflé  
 Plain de caroigne et vile ordure,  
 Dont pardessoutz et pardessure  
 S'espurge, et est trop abhosmé.<sup>4</sup>

Spenser's "belly . . . upblowne" is identically  
 Gower's "ventre enflé"<sup>5</sup>; "most like a brutish beast" is

<sup>2</sup> Ll. 8431-36. So four lines later:

Par tout le pais environ  
 N'y laist gelline ne capoun,  
 Ainz tolt et pile a sa pitance,  
 Ove tout celle autre appourtenance;  
 Et si ly povre en fait parlance,  
 Lors fait sa paie du bastoun . . .  
 Ne luy souffist tantsoulement  
 Ensi piler du povre gent,  
 Ainçois des riches aprompter  
 Quiert et leur orr et leur argent,  
 Pour festoier plus largement;  
 Car riens luy chalt qui doit paier,  
 Maisq'il s'en pourra festoier . . .  
 Maldit soit tieu festoient!

(Ll. 8440-45, 8449-55, 8460).

Cf. also ll. 8407-08.

<sup>3</sup> *xxi*, 3, 8-9.

<sup>4</sup> Ll. 8347-52. Cf. ll. 8333-34:

Car de son ventre le forsfait  
 Est de vomite en grant danger.

See, indeed, the whole section.

<sup>5</sup> Luxury, too, is directly associated with Gluttony at least twice in the pertinent passages in Gower. See ll. 8605-06; 985, 989. Upton's parallel for "His belly was upblowne with luxury"—"Inflatum

"semblable de nature Au chien"; Gower's fourth line is summed up in "his gorge"; and the verbal identity of the last lines in each needs no comment.<sup>6</sup>

His drunken corse he scarce upholden can:  
In shape and life *more like a monster then a man.*<sup>7</sup>

Ce fait homme yvre en son degré.  
Car il n'ad corps, ainz enfiéblis  
Plus que dormant s'est endormis . . .  
*Il n'est pas homme* au droit devis,  
Ne beste, ainz est *disfiguré*,  
*Le monstre* dont sont abhosmé  
Dieus et nature a leur avis.<sup>8</sup>

"Disfiguré" appears in the preceding stanza as "*deformed* creature"; the other verbal parallels, I think, speak for themselves.<sup>9</sup>

hesterno venas, ut semper, Iaccho" (Vergil, *Ecl.*, vi, 15)—is not verbal (except in "inflatum"), and it is not accompanied (as in the case of "ventre . . . enflé") by further parallels for almost every word of its immediate context.

<sup>6</sup> Somewhat earlier in the description of the five daughters of Gluttony, Gower has also laid emphasis on the Glutton's belly:

So large pance au plein garnie,  
Sicome le grange est du frument (ll. 7737-38).

And he at once proceeds to compare it to the tautness of a tennis ball (ll. 7741-45). Vomit is also associated with Gluttony in *Le Pelerinaige*. Gluttony says she is properly called "Gastrimargie," and that is "vne plongerie et submersion de morceaulx." Then (she continues),

Puis quen mon sac les ay plungiez  
Et si te dy bien quen sachez  
Jen ay que renomir et rendre  
Ma conuenu et hors respandre (f. xliiii<sup>vo</sup>).

See the *Pilgrimage*, ll. 12839-49. But the other details are wholly wanting.

<sup>7</sup> xxii, 8-9.

<sup>8</sup> Ll. 8187-89, 8193-96.

<sup>9</sup> The corresponding passage in the *Confessio Amantis* (vi, 44-47) is as follows:

Whose mind in meat and drinke was *drowned* so.<sup>10</sup>

Dont [au boire] l'alme pert le seignourage  
Du corps, et corps de son oultrage  
Tres tous ses membres *plonge et noie*.<sup>11</sup>

Full of diseases was his carcas blew.<sup>12</sup>

De Gule qui vouldra chanter  
Ses laudes, om la poet loer  
De sesze pointz, dont je l'appelle:  
L'estommac grieve au digestier,  
La resoun trouble au droit jugier,  
Le ventre en dolt ove la bouelle,  
La goute engendre et la cervelle  
Subverte, et l'oill de cil ou celle  
Cacheus les fait enobscurer,  
La bouche en put plus que chanelle,  
L'oraile auci et la naselle  
Du merde fait superfluer.<sup>13</sup>

And the "dry dropsie" of the next line has been discussed above.

---

And for the time he knoweth no wyht,  
That he ne wot so moche as this,  
What maner thing himselven is,  
Or he be *man*, or he be *beste*.

I shall take up below the part played by the *Confessio* in Spenser's rather startling procedure. It is sufficient to note here that it is clearly the *Mirour* and not the *Confessio* on which, in this instance, he has drawn. None of the passages from the *Mirour* thus far cited have been taken over by Gower into the *Confessio*. He explicitly confines (vi, 11-14) his treatment of Gluttony to two branches—"Dronkeschipe" and "Delicacie."

<sup>10</sup> xxiii, 4.

<sup>11</sup> Ll. 8122-24. The phrase "plonge et noie" perhaps represents a commonplace. Gluttony (as "Gastrimargie") in the *Pelerinage* remarks: "Trestous lopins ie plunge et noye" (f. xliiii<sup>vo</sup>). But the turn given to the phrase in de Deguileville (where the morsels which Gluttony swallows are drowned in her "sac") is very different from that in Gower and Spenser, where it is the mind or the members controlled by the mind that are drowned in meat and drink—or (as in Gower) in drink alone.

<sup>12</sup> xxiii, 6.

<sup>13</sup> Ll. 8593-8604.

The correspondences thus far given are scarcely susceptible of more than one interpretation. In his description of Gluttony, Spenser has drawn upon Gower, it would seem, for the suggestion of a number of his most vivid touches. But he has characteristically interwoven them with materials from other sources. Even in such cases, however, the hint in at least one instance may have come from Gower. The "bouzing can" has been identified with the "cantharus" in Vergil's description of Silenus.<sup>14</sup> But Gower's "beau cop de vin envessellé" may certainly have been the intermediary, if not the sole suggestion.<sup>15</sup> Silenus (this time by way of Ovid) does perhaps appear in xxii, 8: "His dronken corse he scarse upholden can."<sup>16</sup> And that the vine leaves and ivy garlands of stanza xxii belong to either Bacchus or Silenus there is little doubt. The crane's neck seems to go back ultimately to the Nichomachean Ethics,<sup>17</sup> but it had evidently become a commonplace.<sup>18</sup> In a word, the portrait of Gluttony is a composite, but by far the largest contribution is John Gower's.

<sup>14</sup> *Ecl.* vi, 17: "Et gravis attrita pendebat cantharus ansa" (Upton).

<sup>15</sup> The line "And eke with fatness swollen were his eyne" (xxi, 4) has been properly referred to the Prayer Book version of the Psalms (*Psa.* lxxiii, 7; "Their eyes swell with fatness"). But Gower writes:

C'est ly pechés dont Job disoit  
 Qe tout covert du crasse avoit  
 La face (ll. 7777-79)—

and this may have suggested to Spenser the happier phrase.

<sup>16</sup> *Met.* iv, 27: "Et pando non fortiter haeret asello."

<sup>17</sup> iii, 13.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. the *Pilgrimage*:

By that golet, large and strong,  
 Off mesour nat .iij. Enche long;  
 I wolde, ffor delectacioun,

The case of Avarice is no less remarkable. I shall give at once the more striking parallels.

*And unto hell him selfe for money sold:  
Accursed usury was all his trade.*<sup>19</sup>

*Cil q'ensi doublement usure  
Et fait le vice ou le procure,  
Au deables est le droit marchand;  
Dont en la Cité q'est oscure  
Pour gaign q'il prent a present hure  
Prendra le gaign del feu ardant.*<sup>20</sup>

*Ne scarce good morsell all his life did taste,  
But both from backe and belly still did spare,  
To fill his bags, and richesse to compare:  
Yet childe ne kinsman living had he none  
To leave them to . . .*<sup>21</sup>

*L'enfrons eschars au mangerie  
Ne quiert avoir amy n'amy,  
Ainz tout solein s'en vait mangant;  
Et de s'escharceté menant  
Les grans tresors vait amassant,  
Nonpas pour soy, car sa partie  
N'en ose prendre a son vivant,  
Dont un estrange despendant  
Après sa mort tout l'esperprie.*<sup>22</sup>

It is worth while to dwell for a moment on this passage. The first line (l. 3) in Spenser is an easy inference from the first three lines in Gower. But the next two lines in Spenser, as compared with the next two lines in Gower,

---

That yt were (off his ffacoun)  
Long as ys a kranys nekke [col de grue]  
(ll. 12899-903).

See also *Ayenbite of Inwyrt* (E. E. T. S.), p. 56, and compare Professor Dodge's note in the *Cambridge Spenser*. Alciati may be best consulted in the edition of 1546. To his lines under Gula add those under Invidia and Avaritia.

<sup>19</sup> xxvii, 7-8.

<sup>20</sup> Ll. 7303-08.

<sup>21</sup> xxviii, 3-7.

<sup>22</sup> Ll. 7528-36.

afford a signal exemplification of Spenser's procedure. *Menant* (l. 7531) is not in Professor Macaulay's glossary. It is, however, a variant form of *manant* ("rich, opulent"), of which numerous examples are given in Godefroy.<sup>23</sup> Gower's "et de s'escharceté menant" ("rich from his stinginess") becomes "But both from back and belly still did spare To fill his bags." The abstract, rather epigrammatic line of the original has been expanded into a concrete and picturesque equivalent, and the "richesse to compare" which follows is, of course, "les grans tresors vait amassant" of Gower's next line. The correspondence of the following lines is obvious. The three statements, that is, in Spenser's four and a half lines (3; 4-5; 6-7) follow the same order, with the same connection, and in part with actual paraphrase, the corresponding statement in Gower.<sup>24</sup>

And now I come to a phase of the matter on which I enter with some hesitation. For the procedure which Spenser seems to have followed is too remarkable to command assent without indubitable evidence. Yet the evidence (which, as we shall see, extends beyond this passage) seems again to point to only one conclusion. And one's instinctive skepticism is after all perhaps without full warrant.

<sup>23</sup> The form *manant* occurs in l. 5807 of the *Mirour*: "Et d'estre riches et *manant*"; l. 17260: "Si tu n'es riche et bien *manant*." It is in the combination "riche et *manant* [*menant*]" that the word commonly occurs, and it would have offered no difficulty to Spenser.

<sup>24</sup> The idea of wasting no money on clothes (which is obvious enough) appears in connection with Avarice in the *Pilgrimage*:

And that I am thus evele arrayed,  
I do yt only off entent  
That my gold be not spent,  
On clothys wastyd, nor my good (ll. 17462-65).

But its context is entirely different from that in Gower and Spenser, where it is the common order of common details that is significant.

Gower—as has been well known since Professor Macaulay's publication of the lost French poem—made large use of the *Mirour* in the *Confessio Amantis*, as he had earlier used it in the *Vox Clamantis*, on which in turn he also drew in the *Confessio*. "What he had said in one language he was apt to repeat in another,"<sup>25</sup> and much of the material in the *Mirour* which deals with the Seven Deadly Sins (*not*, however, any part of the description of the procession or of the marriage of Pride) is transferred almost bodily to the English work. And what I have now to point out is that Spenser seems to have turned to (or perhaps recalled) some of these corresponding passages in the *Confessio* to supplement his borrowings from the *Mirour*. And the present passage is a case in point. The lines in the *Confessio* run as follows:

Bot Avarice natheles,  
 If he mai geten his encess  
 Of gold, that wole he serve and kepe,  
 For he takth of noght elles kepe,  
 Bot *forto fille his bagges* large;  
 And al is to him bot a charge,  
 For he ne parteth noght withal,  
 Bot kepeth it, as a servant schal:  
 And thus, thogh that he multiplie  
 His gold, withoute tresorie  
 He is, for man is noght amended  
 With gold, bot if it be despended  
 To mannes us; whereof I rede  
 A tale, etc.<sup>26</sup>

It is obviously not from the *Confessio* that Spenser has drawn the major part of xxviii, 2-7, as quoted above. The development of the thought is entirely different; the references to Avarice's diet and to his lack of heirs are absent in the *Confessio*, as are the lines directly paraphrased.

<sup>25</sup> Macaulay, in I, p. xxxvi.

<sup>26</sup> v, 125-138.



But one phrase in Spenser's lines—"to fill his bags"—, wanting in the *Mirour*, is found in the *Confessio*. That by itself might be coincidence. But Spenser's stanza ends with a detail for which there is no parallel in the *Mirour*:

. . . but thorough daily care  
To get, *and nightly feare to lose his owne*,  
*He led a wretched life, unto himselfe unknowne.*<sup>27</sup>

Just that detail, however, is in the *Confessio*, a little farther on in the account of Avarice:

Men oghten Avarice eschuie;  
For what man thilke vice suie,  
He get himself bot litel reste.  
For hou so that the body reste,  
The herte upon the gold travaileth,  
*Whom many a nyhtes drede assaileth;*  
For thogh he ligge abedde naked,  
His herte is everemore awaked,  
And dremeth, as he lith to slepe,  
*How besi that he is to kepe*  
*His tresor, that no thief it stele.*  
*Thus hath he bot a woful wele.*<sup>28</sup>

What is not in the *Mirour* is in the *Confessio*, and in each instance the borrowings are partly verbal. We shall soon see more.

The first five lines of stanza xxix are marked by what Professor Percival has called "the antithetic balances in [their] Euphuism."<sup>29</sup> And this balanced structure Spenser has again drawn directly from Gower—this time chiefly (but not wholly) from the *Confessio*.

Most wretched wight, whom nothing might suffice;  
Whose greedy lust did lacke in greatest store;  
Whose need had end, but no end covetise;

<sup>27</sup> XXVIII, 7-9.

<sup>28</sup> v. 417-28.

<sup>29</sup> *The Faerie Queene, Book I* (1902), p. 233.

Whose welth was want, whose plenty made him pore;  
 Who had enough, yett wished ever more;  
 A vile disease: etc.

The fourth line of the stanza (it can scarcely be doubted) is from the *Mirour*:

C'est cil q'est *riche et souffreitous*,<sup>30</sup>  
*Du propre*<sup>31</sup> et *auci busoignous*,<sup>32</sup>  
 Comme s'il du rein fuist possessour.<sup>33</sup>

Gower's two lines—who is *rich* and *in want*, *possessed of goods* and also *needy*—seem simply to have been compacted into one by Spenser: “Whose *welth* was *want*, whose *plenty* made him *pore*.”<sup>34</sup> And there is no equivalent for these lines in the *Confessio*. They immediately follow in the *Mirour*, however, a stanza describing the pains of Tantalus<sup>35</sup>—a stanza which is paraphrased (and in part

<sup>30</sup> “In want” (Macaulay).

<sup>32</sup> “Needy” (Macaulay).

<sup>31</sup> Possessed of property.

<sup>33</sup> Ll. 7636-38.

<sup>34</sup> This is not inconsistent with Upton's assumption that the last phrase of Spenser's line is suggested by Ovid's “inopem me copia fecit” (*Met.* III, 466)—which is not, however, said of Avarice. The two lines of Gower, from a passage which deals with “Avarice par especial,” account for all the balanced words in Spenser's line. That the particular turn of his phrase may be due to his recollection of Ovid is both possible and in keeping with his general procedure.

<sup>35</sup>

Dame Avarice est dite auci  
 Semblable au paine Tantalí,  
 Q'est deinz un flum d'enfern estant  
 Jusq'au menton tout assorbi,  
 Et pardessus le chief de luy  
 Jusq'as narils le vait pendant  
 Le fruit des pommes suef flairant;  
 Mais d'un ou d'autre n'est gustant,  
 Dont soit du faym ou soif gary,  
 Les queux tous jours vait endurant.  
 Dont m'est avis en covoitant  
 Del averous il est ensi (ll. 7621-32).

translated) in the account of Avarice in the *Confessio*.<sup>36</sup> And the lines which immediately follow this very description of Tantalus in the *Confessio* are these:

Lich to the peines of this flod  
 Stant Avarice in worldes good:  
*He hath ynough* and *yit* him nedeth,  
 For his skarsnesse it him forbiedeth,  
 And *evere* his hunger after more  
 Travailleth him aliche sore.<sup>37</sup>

Spenser's next line, accordingly—"who had enough, | yet | wished ever more"—is almost word for word in the *Confessio*.<sup>38</sup> The next phrase in Spenser—"a vile disease"<sup>39</sup>—takes us at once to another passage in Gower, the description, namely, of the dropsy, which Spenser had already transferred from Avarice to Gluttony.<sup>40</sup> Like the account of Tantalus, it appears in both the *Mirour* and the *Confessio*. In the *Mirour* it precedes, with one stanza between, the description of Tantalus already quoted.

Cil q'ad le mal d'idropsie,  
 Comme plus se prent a beverie,  
 Tant plus du soif desnatural

<sup>36</sup> v, 363-97.

<sup>37</sup> v, 391-96. This passage (it may also be noted) is on the same page with the lines about the "nyhtes drede" quoted above, p. 419.

<sup>38</sup> There is a very similar line—"Ainz comme plus ad, plus enfamine" (l. 6768)—in the *Mirour*, but it lacks the verbal identity which marks the passage in the *Confessio*.

<sup>39</sup> Church's note: "A vile disease of the mind this, viz. *Covetousness*; and, besides that a grievous gout etc."—with its protest against a comma after "disease"—is, of course, sound. It is to be noted that Gower a number of times definitely calls the vice itself (as Spenser does here) a disease. See, for example, *Mirour*, ll. 5365, 5715, etc.

<sup>40</sup> See above, p. 409. It may be noted in passing that the association of specific maladies with the various Sins is not followed out in the *Confessio*.

Ensecche; *et tiele maladie*  
*Ad l'averous de sa partie,*  
 Comme plus ad, meinz est liberal.<sup>41</sup>

But it has evidently recalled to Spenser the corresponding lines in the *Confessio*, for it is there (and not in the *Mirour*) that we find some of his very words:

. . . . bot *he* [Midas] *excedeth*  
*Mesure more than him nedeth.*  
 Men tellen that *the maladie*  
 Which cleped is ydropesie  
 Resembled is unto this vice  
 Be weie of kinde of Avarice:  
 The more ydropesie drinketh,  
 The more him thursteth, for him thinketh  
 That he mai nevere drinke his fille;  
 So that *ther mai nothing fulfille*  
*The lustes of his appetit:*  
 And riht in such a maner plit  
 Stant Avarice and evere stod;  
 The more he hath of worldes good,  
 The more he wolde it kepe streyte,  
*And evere mor and mor coveite.*<sup>42</sup>

Spenser's second and third lines, that is—

*Whose greedy lust did lacke in greatest store;*  
*Whose need had end, but no end covetise—*

seem to be definitely reminiscent of the phraseology of the *Confessio*.<sup>43</sup> The first line of the stanza may derive its light from either poem:

<sup>41</sup> Ll. 7603-08. With the last line, which has the same antithetical quality as lines 2-5 in Spenser's stanza, compare also ll. 7669-70:

*L'omme averous ensi se riche,*  
*Tant comme plus ad, plus en est chiche.*

<sup>42</sup> v, 247-62.

<sup>43</sup> The words "in greatest store" seem to hark back to the picture of Tantalus—or, perhaps, to the account of Midas's feast of gold, which immediately follows in the *Confessio* (ll. 279-89).

Most wretched wight, *whom nothing might suffice;*  
 A l'averous desresonnal . . .  
*N'iert unques plain en ceste vie;*<sup>44</sup>  
 . . . . Avarice,  
 Which of his oghne propre vice  
 Is as the helle wonderfull;  
*For it mai neveremor be full.*<sup>45</sup>

The account of Avarice, then, is drawn almost equally from the *Mirour* and the *Confessio*, and it is possible even to trace, with some assurance, the association of ideas between the two. That the *Mirour* was Spenser's chief source in the canto as a whole there can be no question. The procession and the wedding and a host of verbal parallels belong to it alone. But that he knew the *Confessio* there can be no reasonable doubt in any case.<sup>46</sup> And it is not so remarkable that he should have turned from certain lines in the *Mirour* to what he must have recalled—if he knew the *Confessio* at all—as parallel treatments of the subject.<sup>47</sup> And since he was obviously exploring Gower's mine for gold to coin in his own mint, the results need lay no heavy tax on our credulity. The amazing thing, after all, is the workmanship with which the impossible is accomplished, and bilingual scraps of Gower transmuted into pure, authentic Spenser.

Two or three other details in the account of Avarice demand brief mention. The garb of the Vice (xxviii, 2) is probably drawn (as Upton pointed out) from the descrip-

<sup>44</sup> Ll. 7597, 7602.

<sup>45</sup> v, 347-50.

<sup>46</sup> See below, p. 450.

<sup>47</sup> It should be observed that the borrowings from the *Confessio* are chiefly in the portrait of Avarice that we have just discussed. Their association there with the two very striking passages in the *Mirour* that deal with Tantalus and "Idropsie" would be particularly apt to recall the parallel treatment in the other poem. For other evidence of slighter influence of the *Confessio*, see below, pp. 424, n. 49; 429; 430, n. 82.

tion of Avarice in the *Roman de la Rose*.<sup>48</sup> The suggestion for the "two coffers" (xxvii, 3-4) we have already seen in Gower's "bources."<sup>49</sup> The sixth line of stanza twenty-seven—

For of his wicked pelfe his God he made—

represents what is probably a commonplace.<sup>50</sup> But in the initial list of the Sins in the *Mirour*, on which Spenser drew for Gluttony the Steward and Sloth the Chamberlain,<sup>51</sup> the suggestion for the line lay at his hand:

La quarte est celle d'Avarice,  
Que l'or plus que son dieu cherice.<sup>52</sup>

There is left only the camel to be accounted for. And I am inclined to think that the real point of Spenser's

<sup>48</sup> Ed. Michel, ll. 210 ff. Spenser probably knew it in the Chaucerian translation. See Fragment A, ll. 219 ff. The first line of the stanza—"His life was nigh unto death's dore yplaste"—seems to come from the same account (l. 215): "She was lyk thing for hungre deed" ("Chose sembloit morte de fain").

<sup>49</sup> See above, p. 397. The substitution of the "two coffers" for "des bources . . . plus que dis" of the *Mirour* may have been due to a reminiscence of the second tale which Gower tells in the *Confessio* (v, 2273 ff.) to illustrate Coveitise, in which the story centers about "two cofres" (see especially ll. 2295, 2332). Professor Macaulay's heading, in his edition, is "The Tale of the Two Coffers."

<sup>50</sup> See, at least, the description in de Deguileville of Avarice's "Mawmet" (*Pilgrimage*, ll. 18370-18442; cf. *Pelerinaige*, lxiiv): "Mon ydole est mon mahommet," etc.). Compare especially: "This is the god whiche, by depos, Loueth to be schutte in hucches clos" (ll. 18377-78): "Gold is ther god, gold is ther good; I worschipe gold and my tresour As ffor my god and savyour; Saue gold, noon other god I haue" (ll. 18396-99); "Gold is my god and my Mawmet" (l. 18411). The first lines quoted are in the French ("Cest ung dieu qui emmaillote Veult estre souuent," etc.); the rest are Lydgate's elaborations.

<sup>51</sup> See above, p. 405.

<sup>52</sup> Ll. 253-54. The references to Gluttony and Sloth (ll. 295-98) are on the same folio of the *Mirour*.

choice of the camel has been missed by the commentators. The usual suggestion is that Spenser had in mind the camels in Herodotus, on which the Indians carried off the gold-dust hoarded by the ants,<sup>53</sup> and that, of course, is very possible. But the camel (as does not seem to have been observed) has another and very definite association with Avarice. In the *Pelerinage* the hag Avarice herself is represented as *humped* ("bossue"), and in her long and interesting exposition of "the bouche upon [her] bake"<sup>54</sup> she interprets it as follows:

La bosse est chose superflue  
 Par qui sa regle fait bossue  
 Qui fait le riche comparer  
 Au chamel qui ne peut passer  
 Pour la bosse la porte acus.<sup>55</sup>

Avarice, then, was associated definitely with the camel through the famous saying of Christ. Now Gower makes the same application of the passage. For in the account of Covoitise in the *Mirour* occurs the following:

<sup>53</sup> The camel's power of hoarding water (so to speak) might also have been suggested as a reason for the choice.

<sup>54</sup> *Pilgrimage*, l. 18294.

<sup>55</sup> F. lxii. Compare the *Pilgrimage*:

Ryght so, ryches and gret plente  
 ar cawse that a ryche man,  
 as the gospell rehers[e] can,  
 May in-to heven have none entre,  
 But euen lyke as ye may se,  
 A camell may hym-silffe applye  
 To passen through a nedelyes eye,  
 Whiche is a thyng not credible,  
 But a maner impossible,  
 Thys beste is so encomeraus  
 Off bak corbyd and tortuous,  
 And so to passe, no thyng able (ll. 18310-21).

Pour ce dist dieus, que plus legier  
 L'oill de l'aguile outrepasser  
 Poet ly chameals, q'en ciel entrer  
 La Covoitise q'est mondaine.<sup>56</sup>

It is not necessary to deny that Spenser may have remembered (from Herodotus, or Pliny, or Mandeville) the gold-bearing camels; his symbolism throughout the *Fairie Queene* is often complex enough. But that he also had in mind the more striking and apposite symbolism of the Biblical association seems highly probable. That this particular association was not confined to Gower, I have shown. But in the *Mirour* the suggestion once more lay close to his hand.

Envy follows Avarice. But for reasons which will appear later I shall reserve consideration of its treatment until the last. Meantime, Idleness and Wrath may be dealt with more briefly.<sup>57</sup>

The account of Idleness lays stress on its particular aspect of Somnolence, and Spenser's description is conceived in the spirit of what is perhaps the most vivid passage in this part of the *Mirour*. For the very essence of Gower's conception of Somnolence<sup>58</sup> is the fact that "of devotion he had little care,"<sup>59</sup> and he elaborates his theme with a picturesqueness worthy of Spenser himself.<sup>60</sup> I

<sup>56</sup> Ll. 6750-53.

<sup>57</sup> Once more I wish to say that I am omitting, in the case of each Sin, parallels which, though less definite than those which are given, may still have weight when considered in the light of what the more explicit correspondences seem to disclose. But space is wanting for them all, and I am anxious besides, in a case necessarily so intricate, to avoid all possible complications of the issue.

<sup>58</sup> Ll. 5125-5376, especially ll. 5135-5268.

<sup>59</sup> Compare Professor Tupper's discussion of Sloth and Undevotion (printed after this paper was written) in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXIX, pp. 106-07 (March, 1914).

<sup>60</sup> The passage is one which has been much discussed, on account



shall take space, however, for but two groups of parallels. The first involves the account of Sompnolence already mentioned.

For of devotion he had little care,  
*Still drownd in sleepe, and most of his daies dedd.*<sup>61</sup>

Ainz comme pesant et endormy  
 Ses deux oils clos songe au plus fort,  
 Et ensi *gist comme demy mort*,  
 Qu'il est d'Accidie *ensevely*.<sup>62</sup>

*Scarse could he once uphold his heavie hedd,*  
 To looken whether it were night or day.<sup>63</sup>

. . . . Mais ja du reins s'apreste  
 A dieu prier, *ainz bass la teste*  
*Mettra tout suef sur l'eschamelle,*  
 Et dort, et songe en sa cervelle, etc.<sup>64</sup>

It is, however, in Gower's description of *Ædive* that the most striking parallels occur. I shall compare Spenser's twentieth stanza with a series of passages from Gower which follow one another (with the exception of the second in the order in which they are here given) on the same folio of the *Mirour*.<sup>65</sup>

*From worldly cares himselfe he did esloyne,*  
 And greatly shunned manly exercise.<sup>66</sup>

*De tous labours loign se desmette*  
 Q'au corps ne rent sa due dette.<sup>67</sup>

---

of its supposed bearing on the date of Chaucer's *Troilus*. See Tatlock, *Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works*, pp. 26 ff.; Kittredge, *The Date of Chaucer's Troilus*, pp. 26-27.

<sup>61</sup> XIX, 3-4.

<sup>62</sup> Ll. 5145-48. Cf. ll. 255-56: "La quinte Accide *demy morte*, Q'au dieu n'au monde fait service."

<sup>63</sup> XIX, 5-6.

<sup>64</sup> Ll. 5428-51. See also above, p. 397.

<sup>65</sup> They are in the same column in Macaulay's edition.

<sup>66</sup> XX, 1-2.

<sup>67</sup> Ll. 5815-16. Compare especially "himself he did *esloyne*" and

From everie worke he chalenged essoyne.<sup>68</sup>

Quant il s'estrange au tout labour.<sup>69</sup>

. . . . Yet otherwise

*His life he led in lawlesse riotise,*

By which he grew to grievous malady.<sup>70</sup>

. . . Ainz comme volage

*Oedif s'en vait en rigolage . . .*

Dont puis, quant vient le froid orage . . .

*Languir l'estoet en povreté.*<sup>71</sup>

For in his lustlesse limbs, *through evill guise,*

A shaking fever rained continually.<sup>72</sup>

Ly sages dist, nuls poet comprendre

*Les griefs mals q'Ædivesce emprendre*

*Fait a la gent du fole enprise:*

Car quant la char q'est frele et tendre

N'au dieu n'au siecle voet entendre . . .

Lors sanz arest deinz sa pourprise

Des vices ert vencue et prise.<sup>73</sup>

For "des vices" Spenser has substituted the specific *malady* with which his stanza has to close. The change of the disease from the otherwise quite appropriate lethargy (as in Gower) to the shaking fever is accordingly motivated, it would seem, by his taking over from the account of Ædivesce in Gower a trait—that of indulgence in

"loign se desmette." The two second lines are identical in substance, though without the verbal correspondence of the other two.

<sup>68</sup> xx, 3.

<sup>69</sup> L. 5842.

<sup>70</sup> xx, 4-6.

<sup>71</sup> Ll. 5827-28, 5830, 5832. See also note 73 below.

<sup>72</sup> xx, 7-8.

<sup>73</sup> Ll. 5845-49, 5851-52. The phrase "grew to grievous malady" of Spenser's preceding line corresponds to "languir" (l. 5832) in the passage already quoted. But "les griefs mals" seems to have suggested the *wording*. "Du fole enprise" (especially in its context) is equivalent to "through evill guise"; "la char q'est frele et tendre" is in substance "lustlesse limbs"—"lustlesse" here meaning, of course, "languid" (Todd), "without vigor or energy" (N. E. D.); "sanz arest" and "continually" need no comment; and the striking word "raignd" is paralleled by "vencue et prise."

"riotise"—with which the immediate passage to lethargy would be entirely out of keeping.

In the account of Wrath but two passages need be considered. The first is stanza xxxiv, 3-7.<sup>74</sup>

Through *unadvized rashness* woxen *wood*.<sup>75</sup>

"Unadvized rashness" appears in the *Mirour* as "Fole hastivesse":

Contek du *Fole hastivesse*  
Fait sa privé consailleresse,  
Que n'ad ne resoun ne mesure.<sup>76</sup>

But it seems to have been the parallel lines in the *Confessio* that were in Spenser's mind:

Contek, so as the bokes sein,  
Folhast hath to his Chamberlein,  
Be whos conseil al *unavised*  
Is Pacience most despised,  
Til Homicide with hem meete . . .  
And thus lich to a beste *wod*  
Thei knowe noght the god of lif.<sup>77</sup>

*For of his hands he had no gouvernement,  
Ne car'd for blood in his avengement.*<sup>78</sup>

. . . fol Contek, qui piere et miere  
*De sa main fole et violente*  
Blesce ou mehaigne . . .

<sup>74</sup> The striking parallel in connection with Wrath's *lion* has already been discussed (p. 399 above). His "burning brand" is not in the *Mirour*; the familiar comparisons between wrath and fire are frequent. See especially ll. 3938-41, 3971-72, and 5101-06, with its comparison of "*cruele Ire*" (cf. xxxv, 1) to Greek fire. With the "sparcles" of xxxiii, 5, cf. ll. 3987-88: "*Car d'ire dont son cuer esprent Tiele estencelle vole entour,*" and with "*hasty rage*" (xxxiii, 9) cf. ll. 3866, 3965. But these are commonplaces.

<sup>75</sup> xxxiv, 3.

<sup>76</sup> Ll. 4741-43—and compare the entire stanza.

<sup>77</sup> III, 1095-99, 1106-07.

<sup>78</sup> xxxiv, 4-5.

Que *par ses mains* soit espandu  
 Sicome du porc le sanc humein.<sup>70</sup>

*His cruel facts* he often would repent.<sup>80</sup>

Trop perest Moerdre horrible et fals  
 En compassant *ses fais mortals*;<sup>81</sup>

He, Ire, ove *ta cruele geste*,  
 En tous *tes fais* es deshonneste.<sup>82</sup>

The second passage is the account, in stanza xxxv, of the "many mischiefs" that follow Wrath. The list is in part, as has been recognized, an enumeration of the "boughs" of Wrath, and as such is conventional. Two lines, however, seem to indicate that Spenser still had in mind Gower's embodiment of the convention. The reference to "*unmanly murder*" varies from the usual phraseology, which commonly employs the term "homicide" or "manslaughter." The *Mirour*, however, includes "Moerdre," and strongly emphasizes its *unmanly* element:

Mais l'Omicide ad un servant  
 Q'est d'autre fourme mesfaisant  
 Mortiel, et si ad *Moerdre* a noun:

<sup>70</sup> Ll. 4778-80, 4805-06. With Spenser's next line—"But, when the furious fitt was overpast"—compare: "Car pour le temps que l'ire dure" (l. 3891); "Que pour le temps que l'ire endure" (l. 4014), and add l. 4677.

<sup>80</sup> xxxiv, 7.

<sup>81</sup> Ll. 4873-74.

<sup>82</sup> Ll. 5065-66. The idea of *repenting*, which is not in the *Mirour*, may possibly have been suggested by the following lines in the *Confessio* (under Homicide) about the strange bird with a man's face, which, when it sees the man it has slain,

. . . . anon he thenketh  
 Of his misdede, and it forthenketh  
 So gretly, that for pure sorwe  
 He liveth noght til on the morwe  
 (III, 2613-16).

*Cist tue viel, cist tue enfant,  
 Cist tue femmes enpreignant . . .  
 Cist tue l'omme par poisoun,  
 Cist tue l'omme en son dormant.*<sup>83</sup>

Rancor and despite are, of course, commonplaces, but it is worth noting that in the *Mirour*, as in Spenser, they are named in the same line:

Bitter *despight*, with *rancours* rusty knife.<sup>84</sup>

Ce sont *Rancour* et *Maltalent*.<sup>85</sup>

The account of Lechery is couched in more general terms than any of the others, and although its substance is to be found in the *Mirour*, I have observed no very definite parallels in phraseology beyond those already noted.<sup>86</sup>

There is left the account of Envy, which I have reserved till the last, in order to bring it into closer juxtaposition with the remarkable parallels in Books IV and V of the *Faerie Queene*. The description of Envy in the procession is largely made up of recognized commonplaces, with two markedly distinctive details—the toad, and the spewing of spiteful poison from leprous mouth. I shall first deal with the more conventional traits.

The last four lines of the thirtieth stanza are commonplaces. Starting with Ovid,<sup>87</sup> they appear with great detail in almost all the later accounts of Envy.<sup>88</sup> But they occur also in Gower, and in the light of what we have already seen we need not be surprised to find that it is the *Mirour* that apparently suggested Spenser's phrasing.

<sup>83</sup> Ll. 4861-65, 4868-69.

<sup>84</sup> xxxv, 4.

<sup>85</sup> L. 4575. Compare l. 4640: "Dont son *coutell* *maltalentine*."

<sup>86</sup> See above, p. 397.

<sup>87</sup> *Met.* II, 778-81.

<sup>88</sup> See the very incomplete list in Percival, p. 223.

*At neighbours welth, that made him ever sad.*<sup>89</sup>

D'Envie ce sont ly mestier . . .  
*Et doloir sur le prosperer*  
*De ses voisins.*<sup>90</sup>

The next line but one—"And wept, that cause of weeping none he had"—is with little doubt from Ovid: "Vixque tenet lacrimas; quia nil lacrimabile cernit."<sup>91</sup>

*But when he heard of harme he wexed wondrous glad.*<sup>92</sup>

*Si mal de luy parler orroit,*  
*Dedeinz son cuer s'esjoyeroit.*<sup>93</sup>

The close parallel in the case of the kirtle of Envy, (xxxi, 1-2) has already been discussed,<sup>94</sup> and the snake, as associated with the Vice, is, of course, a commonplace.<sup>95</sup> The next three lines link Envy definitely with his colleagues in the procession, and the first two lines of the next stanza summarize conventional material. The two lines next following (xxxii, 3-4) embody a thrust of Spenser's own at the Antinomians. But in the fifth line we come back to Gower's phraseology:

<sup>89</sup> xxx, 6.

<sup>90</sup> Ll. 3697, 3700-01. "Welth" is, of course, here "prosperity." "Sorrow for another man's joy" is treated in the *Confessio* only in connection with *love*.

<sup>91</sup> *Met.* II, 796. But compare also *Mirour*, l. 3106: "Ainz plourte, quant autri voit rier."

<sup>92</sup> xxx, 9.

<sup>93</sup> Ll. 3202-03. The corresponding passage in the *Confessio* reads:

Which envious takth his gladnesse  
 Of that he *seth* the *hevinesse*  
 Of othre men (II, 223-25).

It is obvious that in this case the suggestion does not come from the *Confessio*.

<sup>94</sup> See above, p. 397.

<sup>95</sup> See especially the *Ancren Riwele*, the *Ayenbite of Inwoyt*, and the *Pilgrimage*.

So every good to bad he doth abuse.

Le bien en mal fait destorner.<sup>96</sup>

Even in the case of admittedly conventional details, accordingly, there are rather definite indications that Gower was the immediate influence.<sup>97</sup>

We may now come to the two<sup>98</sup> distinctive details. And first the toad:

. . . . [he] still did chaw

Between his cankred teeth a venemous tode,

That all the poison ran about his chaw.<sup>99</sup>

Warton long ago referred the passage in Spenser to Ovid.<sup>100</sup> That Spenser had the description in the *Metamorphoses* in mind there can be no doubt, since the very detail which Warton sets down as Spenser's addition is merely a slight expansion of another of Ovid's lines. For

<sup>96</sup> L. 2687. Compare l. 2988: "Dont ly bien sont en mal torné." The only line in the *Confessio* which at all corresponds is II, 407: "He torneth preisinge into blame"—and this is taken over from another passage in the *Mirour*: "Sique du pris le finement Ert a blamer" (II. 2718-19).

<sup>97</sup> Although it is not on correspondences of this sort that the case rests, it must still be remembered that even commonplaces may be borrowed from definite sources. Where they occur in conjunction with common details that are *not* conventional—in other words, where there is independent evidence that the work in which they appear is known to the second writer—such similarities in phraseology as are noted above must be granted a certain weight. Independent value, of course, they have none.

<sup>98</sup> Including the kirtle, really *three*. See p. 397.

<sup>99</sup> XXX, 2-4.

<sup>100</sup> *Observations on the Faerie Queene* (1754), p. 47: "Ovid tells us, that Envy was found eating the flesh of vipers, which is not much unlike Spenser's picture. But our author has heighten'd this circumstance to a most disgusting degree; for he adds, that the poyson ran about his jaw. This is, perhaps, one of the most loathsome ideas that Spenser has given us." The line to which Warton refers is *Met.* II, 768-69: "videt intus [Invidiam] edentem Vipereas carnes."

"his cankred teeth" is Ovid's "livent rubigine dentes" a little farther on (II, 776), and the next line in Spenser (to which Warton objects)—"That all the poison ran about his chaw"—is *Ovid's* next line: "Pectora felle virent; lingua est suffusa veneno."<sup>101</sup> Now in the mediæval accounts the representation of Envy as *chewing* some object is common enough.<sup>102</sup> And it occurs in the long description of Detraction in the *Mirour*.<sup>103</sup> But neither there nor in any of the accounts that I know is the *toad* the object. In the description of Delicacie (under Gluttony), however, just before a peculiarly vivid account of the eating of serpents,<sup>104</sup> occurs the following:

<sup>101</sup> The portrayal of Invidia in the second book of the *Metamorphoses* was enormously influential in the development of the stock conception of Envy as one of the Seven Deadly Sins.

<sup>102</sup> See, for instance, in the *Pilgrimage*, the account of Detraction gnawing a bone (l. 14806), and the amplification of its symbolism in ll. 15288-15316 (in the *Pelerinage*, folios liii-iv). The idea is also elaborated in the *Mirour*:

Semblance a la hyene porte,  
Que char mangut de la gent morte;  
Car Malebouche rounge et mort  
Ensi le vif sicomme le mort . . .  
He, quelle bouche horrible et fort,  
Que tout mangut et riens desporte!

(ll. 2884-87, 2891-92).

The third line above appears in substance (in an otherwise mildly phrased account of the lover's detraction of his rivals) in the *Confessio*:

For ever on hem I rounge and gknaue (II, 520).

Compare *Pilgrimage*, ll. 15007-10, where Detraction is taught to eat men's flesh, and "gnaue and Rounge hem to the boonys" (*Pelerinage*, f. liii: "et iusques aux os les ronger").

<sup>103</sup> See the passage quoted in the preceding note.

<sup>104</sup> Le chief des serpens suchera,  
Sicomme fait enfes la mammelle (ll. 8081-82).

See the whole stanza.



Et le doulgour de sa pitance  
 Serront *crepalde envenimé*:  
 Ja d'autre piment ne clarée  
 Lors emplira sa vile pance.<sup>106</sup>

The passage is in the section immediately preceding the two on which Spenser has drawn freely in his account of Gluttony, and the transfer of the eaten toad from Delicacy to Envy is in keeping with what he has done elsewhere, and need raise no serious question.<sup>106</sup> The parallel (on account of the transfer) is not in itself conclusive, but, taken in conjunction with its immediate setting, it is too striking to be lightly dismissed as accidental.

The second detail peculiar to the two accounts, however, is not open to the same reservation. The reference to the backbiting of poets is possibly enough drawn from Martial,<sup>107</sup> but it is scarcely open to doubt that it is Gower who gives it the distinctive turn:

. . . and spightfull poison spues  
 From leproous mouth on all that ever writt.<sup>108</sup>

For Gower's account of Detraccioun contains the following lines:

Fagolidros, comme fait escire  
 Jerom, en grieu volt tant a dire  
 Comme cil qui chose q'est maldite  
 Mangut, dont le vomit desire:  
 Et ensi cil q'en voet mesdire,  
 De l'autri mals trop se delite

---

<sup>106</sup> Ll. 8073-76. The toad appears in two other passages in the account of the Sins in Gower—once not as eaten, but as the eater (ll. 8567-68); once as the punitive pillow of Sompnolence (ll. 5335-37).

<sup>106</sup> That the fable of the toad swelling with Envy, to which Upton refers (with the citation of Horace, *Sat.*, II, iii, 314), may have contributed its quota is of course possible.

<sup>107</sup> *Epigr.* v, 10 (Percival).

<sup>108</sup> XXXII, 7-8.

A manger les; mais au vomite  
 Les fait venir, et les recite,  
 Quant il les autres voet despire.<sup>109</sup>

The unusual figure of *vomit* in this connection is striking enough, but the *poison* also appears in the next stanza but one, still with reference to detractors:

. . . ils leur lange ont fait agu  
 Comme du serpent, et plus grevain  
 Dedeinz leur lievres ont reçu  
 Venym, que quant s'est espandu,  
 Fait a doubter pres et longtain.<sup>110</sup>

Moreover, the suggestion for Envy's "leprous mouth" is no less clear. The disease specifically associated with Envy in the *Mirour* is the "hectic":

Au maladie q'est nommé  
 Ethike Envie est comparé.<sup>111</sup>

But Spenser has already used the fever for *Idleness*. In the same summarizing section in which "Ethike" appears, however, two full stanzas are given to a comparison between Envy and *leprosy*:

Sicomme du lepre est deformé  
 En corps de l'omme la beuté,  
 Ensi de l'alme la figure  
 Envie fait desfiguré, etc.<sup>112</sup>

But that is not all. In the section on *Detraccioun* from which the figure of vomit is drawn, the case of Miriam is given as an *exemplum*:

Maria la soer Moyses  
 Son frere detrahist du pres,  
 Qu'il ot pris femme ethiopesse:

<sup>109</sup> Ll. 2749-57.

<sup>110</sup> Ll. 2780-84. See also below, pp. 442, 446.

<sup>111</sup> Ll. 3817-18.

<sup>112</sup> Ll. 3769-72.

Mais sa detraccioun apres  
 La fist porter trop charrant fees;  
 Car dieus en son corous l'adesce  
*Du lepre . . .* <sup>113</sup>

In Gower as in Spenser, that is, leprosy is associated not only with Envy in general, but with Detraction in particular, and both the choice of leprosy as the disease ascribed to Envy and the specific turn given to it in the phrase "leprous *mouth*" are present in Gower's lines. As we shall see in a moment, however, the evidence for Spenser's use of the account of Envy in the *Mirour* does not rest on the portrait in the procession alone.

Spenser's great descriptive passage, then—to take stock for a moment—agrees with the *Mirour* (and apparently with the *Mirour* alone) in its framework of beasts, objects carried in the hand, and maladies. And this definite structural outline is filled in with a wealth of detail which parallels directly (often even verbally) the descriptions of the same Sins in the *Mirour* and (in part) in the *Confessio*. And the procession in the *Faerie Queene* is projected against the striking and distinctive background of the procession in the *Mirour*. In his dealing with the framework—with the large composition of his canvas—Spenser has exercised the breadth and freedom of handling which marks his treatment of Ariosto elsewhere. In the massing of his details, on the other hand, he employs the closer verbal imitation with which he elsewhere follows Tasso. If I am right, he found his framework ready to his hand in Gower's series of strikingly pictorial, arresting stanzas; he found a mine of suggestive detail in the unwieldy mass of descriptive material that followed, as well as in its partial reëmbodiment in Gower's later work; and

<sup>113</sup> LI. 2653-59.

he proceeded to select and combine. Read in the light of its sources, the Progress of the Seven Deadly Sins is seen as a *tour de force* of masterly technique, that has fused disjointed and intractable materials into a rounded and balanced whole that is one of the imperishable glories of English verse.<sup>114</sup>

### III

Up to this point we have been dealing solely with the Progress of the Seven Deadly Sins in the first book of the *Faerie Queene*. But the evidence that Spenser knew and used the *Mirour* is not confined to the great canto that glorifies the House of Pride. In two other passages in the *Faerie Queene* Spenser comes back to Envy (both specifically and in two of its branches), and in both descriptions the influence of the older poem seems to be clear. The first is the account of the "foule and loathly creature . . . men Selaunder call" in the eighth canto of the fourth book; the second is the long and detailed description of the "two old ill favour'd Hags," Envie and Detraction, in the twelfth canto of the fifth book. I shall once more confine myself to the more striking correspondences. The list could easily be made much longer.

<sup>114</sup> After this article had been announced (as a paper read by title at the meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, Harvard University, Dec. 29-31, 1913), Professor Tatlock kindly called my attention to an article of his own on "Milton's Sin and Death" (*Modern Language Notes*, xxi, No. 8—Dec., 1906—pp. 241-42), in a footnote to which he refers to the procession of the Sins in the *Mirour*. He there suggests, however, correspondences between the passage in Gower and Spenser's Mask of Cupid in *F. Q.*, III, xii, and makes no mention of the procession in I, iv. I doubt whether the Mask of Cupid is influenced by Gower. But Spenser's use of the *Mirour* at least leaves the way open for the suggestion that Milton may have used it too.

In Book IV, Canto viii, the Squire of Dames, Æmylia, and Amoret come to a little cottage, where they find

. . . one old woman sitting there beside  
Upon the ground in ragged rude attyre,  
With filthy lockes about her scattered wide,  
Gnawing her nayles for felnesse and for yre,  
And thereout sucking venime to her part's entyre.<sup>1</sup>

The next stanza continues:

A foule and loathly creature sure in sight,  
And in condition to be loath'd no lesse;  
For she was stuf with rancour and despight<sup>2</sup>  
Up to the throat, that oft with bitternesse  
It forth would breake, and gush in great excesse,  
Pouring out streames of poyson and of gall  
Gainst all that truth or vertue doe professe; <sup>3</sup>  
Whom she with leasings lewdly did miscall  
And wickedly backbite: Her name men Sclaunder call.

That Spenser in this stanza is recalling and elaborating his own earlier description is obvious. In the next two stanzas, however, the indications are clear that he has again turned the pages of the *Mirour*. The passages I shall quote are drawn without exception from Gower's section on Detraccioun, and it will be seen that (with one or two slight shifts) the order of treatment in Spenser and Gower is the same.

Her nature is all goodnesse to abuse.<sup>4</sup>  
Cil est toutdis acustummé  
Derere gent au plus celée  
De mentir et de malparler.<sup>5</sup>

And *causelesse crimes* continually *to frame*,  
Par ce qu'il voit un soul semblant,  
Voit dire qu'il ad veu le fait . . .

<sup>1</sup> xxiii, 4-9.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 431.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 444.

<sup>4</sup> xxv, i. The remaining lines of the stanza follow in order.

<sup>5</sup> Ll. 2680-82.

*Car s'il ne voit aucun forsfait,  
De sa mençonge contrefait  
Ja ne serra le meinz parlant.\**

With which she *guiltlesse persons* may *accuse*,

Quant Malebouche soul et sole  
Voit homme ove femme qui parole,  
*Combien qu'ils n'eiont de mesfaire*  
*Voloir, nientmeinz, 'Vei ci la fole!'*  
Dist il, 'Vei cy comme se rigole!  
Trop est comune leur affaire.'<sup>†</sup>

And *steale away the crowne of their good name*:

Dont *bonne fame est desfamée*.<sup>‡</sup>

Ne ever Knight so bold, ne ever Dame  
So chast and loyall liv'd, but she would strive  
With forged cause them falsely to defame;

These three lines, it will be observed, paraphrase lines 2701-07 of the *Mirour* which I have just quoted above, with a return (in "forged cause") to the "mençonge contrefait" of line 2699 above.<sup>9</sup>

*Ne ever thing so well was doen alive,  
But she with blame would blot, and of due praise deprive.*

---

<sup>9</sup>Ll. 2690-91, 2698-2700.

<sup>†</sup> Ll. 2701-07.

<sup>‡</sup> L. 2685.

<sup>\*</sup> With these same lines and those which immediately follow in Gower—

*Sanz nul deserte esclandre vole,  
Que rougist dames le viare* (ll. 2709-10)—

compare Spenser's thirty-fifth stanza, in which the Squire and the two ladies became the "homme ove femme" of Gower's lines, even to the specific calling of names ("Vei ci la fole!", "Vei cy comme se rigole!"), the absence of intention "de mesfaire," and the ladies' shame ("Que rougist dames le viare"):

That shamefull Hag, the *Slaunder* of her sexe,  
Them followed fast, and them reviled sore,  
*Him calling thefe, them whores*; that much did vex  
His noble hart; thereto she did annexe  
False crimes and facts, *such as they never ment*,  
*That those two ladies much asham'd did wexe* (xxxv, 2-7).

*Quant ceste fille [Malebouche] son amy  
 Vorra priser vers ascuny  
 'Salve,' endirra darreinement;<sup>10</sup>  
 Lors contera trestout parmy  
 Si male teche soit en luy;  
 Sique du pris le finement  
 Ert a blamer.<sup>11</sup>*

The next stanza carries on the parallels.

*Her words were not, as common words are ment,  
 T'expresse the meaning of the inward mind,  
 But noysome breath, and poysnous spirit sent  
 From inward parts, with cancred malice lind,  
 And breathed forth with blast of bitter wind,<sup>12</sup>*

*Tout ensi<sup>13</sup> vait de la parole  
 Que de malvoise langue vole . . .  
 Ensi la bouche au desloyal  
 Par souffle de son malparler  
 La renommée du bon vassal  
 Soudaignement en un journal  
 A tous jours mais ferra tourner.  
 Le souffle au bouche detrahant  
 C'est le mal vent du Babilant . . .  
 Si comme le vent du pestilence.<sup>14</sup>*

Which passing through the eares would pierce the hart,

*Comme la saiette du leger,  
 Quelle ist du main au fort archer,*

---

<sup>10</sup> As Macaulay points out, there is something wrong here. His suggestion that "perhaps we ought to read 'primerement' for 'darreinement'" is probably correct. See *Confessio*, II, 394 ff.

<sup>11</sup> Ll. 2713-19. Compare especially (together with the general parallel in sense) "*male teche . . . blamer*," and "with *blame* would *blot*," in their connection with "*pris*" and "*praise*." See also below, pp. 445-46.

<sup>12</sup> xxvi, 1-5.

<sup>13</sup> The reference in "tout ensi" will be found in the passage next quoted (ll. 2833-37). Spenser has simply reversed the order of statement.

<sup>14</sup> Ll. 2838-39, 2852-58, 2863. With ll. 2854-56 cf. "And steale away the crowne of their good name" above (xxv, 4).

Entre en la char q'est tendre et mole . . .  
 Tout ensi vait de la parole  
 Que de malvoise langue vole.<sup>15</sup>

*And wound the soule it selfe with griefe unkind;*

De l'autry tolt le bon renoun  
 En corps, *et soy en alme tue.*<sup>16</sup>

The last two lines are a commonplace:

For, like the stings of aspes that kill with smart,  
 Her spightfull words did pricke and wound the inner part.

But the same commonplace occurs in the same section of the *Mirour*, in the reference to detractors who

. . . . leur lange ont fait agu  
 Comme du serpent.<sup>17</sup>

If correspondences such as these in sense, order, and phraseology are accidental, it is hard to see on what grounds *any* influence on Spenser has been accepted.

The passage in Book V, Canto XII, is no less striking in its significance. After his battle with Grantorto, Sir Artegall comes upon "two old ill favour'd Hags," who turn out to be Envy and Detraction. The description of the "two griesly creatures"<sup>18</sup> is too long to quote. In part,

<sup>15</sup> Ll. 2833-35, 2838-39. See above, p. 441, n. 13.

<sup>16</sup> Ll. 2975-76.

<sup>17</sup> Ll. 2780-81.

<sup>18</sup> *F. Q.*, V, xii, 28-36. The especially hideous appearance of Envy in particular as described in stanzas 29 and 30 bears a strong resemblance to the portrayal of the seven hags in the *Pilgrimage*. See especially the accounts of Gluttony (*Pilgrimage*, ed. E. E. T. S., p. 346), Lechery—as "olde Venus" (pp. 355-56), Sloth (p. 371), Envy (pp. 398-99), and Avarice (pp. 459-61), and compare the corresponding passages in the *Pelerinaige*. Into the question of Spenser's knowledge and possible use (here and there) of the *Pelerinaige* (or of Lydgate's translation) I may not take space to enter here. I have given in the course of the discussion such parallels as I have observed. It is not impossible that Spenser may have been acquainted with the poem either in French or English.



however, Spenser is once more recalling and expanding the details of his own earlier accounts. In the case of Envy the Ovidian "snake with venime fraught"<sup>19</sup> has taken the place of the "venemous tode," and the detail of the poison running about the jaw has been developed<sup>20</sup> with a gusto equalled only by the zest with which Envy's feeding on his (or her) own maw has been elaborated.<sup>21</sup> But in the next stanza (xxxii) the influence of the *Mirour* seems unmistakable. The borrowings are chiefly (as in the case of Slander in Book IV) from Gower's section on "Detraccioun," with slight use of the section (the next but one) on "Joye d'autry mal"—both of them under Envy.

*But if she heard of ill that any did,  
Or harme that any had, then would she make  
Great cheare, like one unto a banquet bid,  
And in anothers losse great pleasure take,  
As she had got thereby and gayned a great stake.<sup>22</sup>*

*Le mal d'autry l'une a derere  
Reconte, et l'autre la matiere  
Ascoulte du joyouse oïe;  
Car d'autry perte elle est gaignere.<sup>23</sup>*

That Spenser is simply elaborating Gower's lines—compare especially "harm that any had" and "Le mal d'autry"; "in another's losse" and "d'autry perte"; and Spenser's last line with "elle est gaignere"—is obvious.

*The other nothing better was then shee,  
Agreeing in bad will and cancred kynd;  
But in bad maner they did disagree.<sup>24</sup>*

That is to say (the stanza goes on), what Envy conceals, Detraction spreads abroad.<sup>25</sup> So in Gower:

<sup>19</sup> xxx. 5. See above, pp. 433-34.

<sup>20</sup> xxx, 8-9.

<sup>21</sup> xxxi, 6-9.

<sup>22</sup> xxxii, 5-9.

<sup>23</sup> Ll. 3211-14.

<sup>24</sup> xxxiii, 1-3.

<sup>25</sup> xxxiii, 4-5.

La tierce soer est molt diverse,  
 A la seconde soer reverse,  
 Mais sont d'envie parigal;  
 Si l'une est mal, l'autre est perverse.<sup>26</sup>

These are the opening lines of the section from which Spenser has just quoted. Gower's contrast (which Spenser is closely paraphrasing) is between the second and third daughters of Envy—"Dolour d'autry Joye" and "Joye d'autry mal." Spenser, however, as before, is making his own synthesis, and refers them to Envy and Detraction. The next four lines (xxxiii, 6-9) are reminiscent of the account of Slander.<sup>27</sup> In the following stanza, however, a remarkable (but I think perfectly demonstrable) situation develops. Spenser, in accordance with his well-known habit of mind, is recalling once more his own earlier description in Book IV. *But he is also recalling*—or (it would seem) actually turning back to in his exemplar—that part of the account of Detraction in the *Mirour* which he had there used. The first five lines of stanza xxxiv, that is, are reminiscent of the first seven lines of the twenty-fifth stanza in Book IV,<sup>28</sup> but they also recall the corresponding passage in the *Mirour*.

For, whatsoever good by any sayd  
 Or doen she heard, she would streightweyes invent<sup>29</sup>  
 How to deprave or slaunderously upbrayd,  
 Or to misconstrue of a man's intent,  
 And turne to ill the thing that well was ment.

The general correspondence with the *Mirour* is even closer here than in Book IV, as may readily be seen:

Quant Malebouche soul et sole  
 Voit homme ove femme qui parole,

<sup>26</sup> Ll. 3157-60.

<sup>27</sup> See above, pp. 439-40.

<sup>28</sup> Compare iv, viii, 36, ll. 1-5, and 35, l. 4. See above, p. 440.

<sup>29</sup> Compare iv, viii, 25, l. 2, with its parallels. See above, p. 439.

Combien qu'ils n'eïont de mesfaire  
 Voloir, nientmeinz, 'Vei ci la fole!'  
 Dist il, 'Vei cy comme se rigole!  
 Trop est comune leur affaire.'  
 De malparler ne s'en poet taire.<sup>30</sup>

But in the next lines in Spenser the general parallel becomes a verbal one:

Therefore she used *often* to resort  
 To common haunts, and companies frequent,  
 To hearke what any one did good report.

For the very next lines in the *Mirour* are these:

Pour ce sovent, u qu'il repaire,  
 Sanz nul deserte esclandre vole,  
 Que rougist dames le viaire.<sup>31</sup>

The idea of "common haunts" and "companies frequent" is implicit in the picture (in the preceding lines) of Malebouche watching men and women innocently talking, and "misconstruing their intent," and the correspondence of "*resort*" and "*repare*" (not to mention "*often*" and "*sovent*") is explicit. No one would question for a moment Spenser's recollection in the stanza of his own earlier description. Yet the reminiscence of Gower is closer still, and it includes a part of the passage which does not occur in his earlier account. The last line of the stanza discloses a similar state of affairs.

To blot the same with blame, or *wrest in wicked sort*.

"To blot the same with blame" recalls, of course, "But she with blame would blot" in Book IV.<sup>32</sup> In that account the next phrase—"and of due praise deprive"—is suggested by the same sentence in Gower ("sique du pris le

<sup>30</sup> Ll. 2701-07.

<sup>31</sup> Ll. 2708-10.

<sup>32</sup> See above, p. 440.

finement," etc.). Here, however, Spenser's "wrest in wicked sort" sums up in four words *the exact sense of the next five lines in Gower*:

. . . et molt sovent,  
Quant om parolt de bonne gent,  
Lors fait comparisoun ensi,  
*Sique le pris q'al un y tent*  
*N'est dit pour pris, ainz soulement*  
*Pour amerrir le pris d'autry.*<sup>33</sup>

Even the thing that is wrested—"what any one did good report"—is the same: "Quant om parolt de bonne gent."

The relation of the first two lines of Spenser's next stanza to the immediately preceding stanza in the *Mirour* is no less obvious.

And if that any ill she heard of any,  
*She would it eeke,*  
*Et d'une parole ascultant,*  
*Tout une conte maintenant*  
*De sa malice propre fait.*<sup>34</sup>  
. . . and make much worse by telling.  
*Par ce qu'il voit un soul semblant,*  
*Voet dire qu'il ad veu le fait.*<sup>35</sup>

I shall cite but one more parallel.

*Foming with poyson round about her gils,*  
In which her cursed tongue, full sharpe and short,  
*Appear'd like Aspis sting that closely kils.*<sup>36</sup>  
. . . . *leur lange ont fait agu*  
*Comme du serpent, et plus grevain*  
*Dedeinz leur lieveres ont reçu*  
*Venym . . .*<sup>37</sup>

Spenser's repeated recalling of Gower's phraseology is no less striking than his constant recollection of his own.

<sup>33</sup> Ll. 2719-24.

<sup>35</sup> Ll. 2690-91.

<sup>37</sup> Ll. 2780-83.

<sup>34</sup> Ll. 2692-94.

<sup>36</sup> XXXVI, 2-4.

The passage in Book V is reminiscent of the two descriptions in Books I and IV, but he also comes back to Gower precisely as he returns upon himself. And it should be observed that in the accounts in Books IV and V he is drawing<sup>38</sup> from a single section in the *Mirour*—a section, moreover, which he had also used in Book I.<sup>39</sup>

#### IV

The one alternative to the conclusion reached in this paper is the assumption of a common source for both Spenser and Gower. In other words, there is, of course, the possibility that Spenser may have drawn upon the document or documents from which Gower derived *his* materials. That possibility, however, is strongly negatived by all the evidence which we possess. The general conclusions reached by Miss R. E. Fowler in her careful study of the sources of the *Mirour*<sup>40</sup> I had come to independently (although on the basis of less adequate evidence), but I prefer to state them in her words. In the

<sup>38</sup> With the exception of half a dozen lines from the next section but one.

<sup>39</sup> It is very possible that a thorough examination of the *Faerie Queene* would disclose other borrowings from Gower, but I have not had time to make the search. I shall only suggest, in passing, that Spenser may have drawn at least the name *Alma* from the *Alme* of the *Mirour*. Not only is *Alme* (naturally enough) the central figure in the contest of the Vices and the Virtues, but her castle is again and again described in terms which Spenser's account in Book II, cantos ix and xi (both of the House of *Alma* and of the attack on it) recalls. See especially ll. 11281 ff., 11797 ff., 14125 ff., 14712 ff., 16309 ff., 16375 ff.

<sup>40</sup> *Une source française des poèmes de Gower* (Thèse pour le doctorat de l'Université de Paris, 1905). Compare Macaulay, Vol. I, p. liii.

first place, it seems clear that the source of the *Mirour* is not a single document, but that it comprises (so far as its treatment of the Seven Deadly Sins is concerned) at least two distinct elements. "Il est probable que les emprunts de Gower pour la première partie du *Mirour de l'Homme* remontent principalement à deux compositions ou deux groupes de compositions. Dans la première, ou dans les premières, les vices ont dû être représentés comme les filles du Diable; dans la description de leur personne et de leur vie, il n'y avait sans doute rien de masculin. On aurait ici la source de la chevauchée des Vices et de leur mariage avec Péch  dans le po me de Gower.

"L'autre composition, qui semble unique, d'apr s les recherches que j'ai d j  signal es dans cette th se, a d   tre analogue au *Mir our du Monde* et   la *Somme le Roi*. Nous le savons gr ce   ces m mes recherches. Or les vices dans le *Mir our du Monde* et dans la *Somme le Roi* sont   peine personnifi s. C'est vrai qu'on les d signe comme les filles du diable,<sup>41</sup> mais c'est une personnification si l g re qu'elle n'a que la valeur d'une m taphore. Je ne crois pas qu'on puisse trouver une allusion   leur sexe. Dans la somme latine de Peraud, les Vices sont des hommes, et ils sont repr sent s comme les princes d'Enfer et les chefs de bataillon de l'arm e du Diable. L'Orgueil est l'h ritier du Diable; dans les sommes fran aises, c'est sa fille a n e."<sup>42</sup>

In the second place, the sources of the *Mirour* are with practical certainty to be sought among the French (very possibly Anglo-French) or Latin theological or didactic treatises of the preceding century. In substance this is in agreement with Miss Fowler's summing up: "Cette  tude

<sup>41</sup> *Ayenbite* (p. 17); *Mir. du Monde*, MS. 14939 (f. 11 rb).

<sup>42</sup> Fowler, pp. 57-58.

sur les sources du *Mirour de l'Omme* fait mieux connaître la place que doit prendre Gower dans l'histoire de la littérature. Il faut chercher ses modèles en France parmi les écrivains du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle et non parmi ses contemporains." <sup>43</sup>

It is of the utmost importance, then, to observe again <sup>44</sup> that in his fourth canto Spenser includes material drawn from *both* elements in Gower's treatment—from the marriage of the Vices, with its background and accompaniments, and from the sections which constitute essentially a conventional *Summa Vitiorum et Virtutum*. That he should have known both the treatises (or groups of treatises) which underlie Gower's work is in the last degree unlikely. Whatever improbability is felt to attach to his knowledge of the *Mirour* is doubled on such an hypothesis. Indeed it is far more than doubled. For the chances of his acquaintance with a work of Gower—a writer of distinction in precisely the period where his own linguistic interests chiefly lay—are overwhelming in comparison with the chances that he had and drew upon two or more separate documents of the date and character of Gower's sources. To the positive evidence of the close verbal correspondences with the *Mirour* (in conjunction with the *Confessio*) must be added the strong negative testimony of all we know about the sources of the poem.

If valid evidence is at hand, any indictment of *a priori* improbability is thereby quashed. But it may still be worth while to observe that the general unlikelihood which is felt at first blush to attach to the assumption of Spenser's knowledge of the *Mirour* is in any case very largely one of seeming. We are apt to estimate John Gower in the light of our own predilections, and to overlook his dis-

<sup>43</sup> Fowler, p. 80.

<sup>44</sup> See above, p. 407.

tinguished (and by no means undeserved) reputation as a poet not only in his own day, but in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as well.<sup>45</sup> That the *Confessio Amantis* was known to Spenser, who was "much traueiled and thoroughly redd" in the older English writers, and who shows on every page the meticulous care with which he studied them for his own purposes, we may (quite apart from the evidence in this article) be sure.<sup>46</sup> If he knew Gower's English works, he would certainly, with his own strong ethical bias, have been keenly interested in so characteristic a performance as the *Mirour de l'Omme*, if he ever saw it. To

<sup>45</sup> Leland, for example, writing at some time before 1552, states explicitly that Gower's works "vel hoc nostro florentissimo tempore a doctis studiose leguntur" (*Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis*, Oxford, 1709, p. 415; see Bale's repetition of the statement in the *Catalogus*, Cent. vii, No. xxiii). The facts given by Professor Macaulay (*The Works of John Gower*, Vol. II, pp. vii-x) in exemplification of Gower's "great literary reputation" in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries are conclusive, and as he remarks (p. x): "Gower's early popularity and reputation are facts to be reckoned with." Dr. H. Spies's *collectanea* of allusions to Gower (*Englische Studien*, xxviii, 161 ff.; xxxiv, 169 ff.; xxxv, 105 n.) afford still further evidence. Even more striking is the indication of interest in Gower's *French* poems in Yorkshire afforded by one Quixley's translation of the *Traité pour essampler les amanz marietz*, recently printed from a fifteenth-century ms. by Professor H. N. MacCracken (*Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, Vol. xx,—1909—pp. 33-50). The significance of the fifteenth-century Spanish translation of the *Confessio* (now published: *Confesion del Amante por Joan Goer*, ed. Birch-Hirschfeld, Leipzig, 1909), and of the lost Portuguese version cannot be overlooked. None of these facts, of course, prove sixteenth-century acquaintance with the *Mirour*, but they do show the danger of dogmatizing about its improbability.

<sup>46</sup> E. K. (whose words have just been quoted) was well enough read in the *Confessio* to point out in the Glosse to the July Eclogue in the *Shepherd's Calendar*, that *glitterand* is "a particule used sometimes in Chaucer but altogether in I. Gower." Gabriel Harvey, too, not only knew but read Gower. See *Letter-Book of Gabriel Harvey*, A. D. 1573-1580, Ed. Scott (Camden Soc.), p. 134; cf. p. 37.



argue that he could not have seen it, simply because it happens to exist today in but a single manuscript, is a procedure absolutely unwarranted by all the facts. The list of well known and influential works that have survived in unique manuscripts is a long and notable one, and the mere accident of such a survival may be given only its due (and often relatively small) weight. Moreover, until such a manuscript is brought to light, and so made accessible for comparison, it is obviously fallacious to suggest that any lost work has left no traces of its currency. If such traces actually appear, they at once outweigh all considerations based on the accidental vicissitudes of manuscripts. The question, in a word, is purely one of evidence, and in the light of such facts as are here submitted, it is our estimate of general probabilities that must be revised.<sup>47</sup>

Finally, the utmost care has been exercised in this study to avoid any forcing of the facts to make a case. Starting as the investigation did with the more obvious resemblances between the two processions, the evidence has thrust itself upon me step by step. None of my readers can be more

<sup>47</sup> That Spenser, with his antiquarian and archaizing tastes, must have been familiar with *manuscripts*, both at Cambridge and later, there is every reason, *a priori*, to believe. On the general question of his use of manuscripts, see Miss C. A. Harper, *The Sources of British Chronicle History in Spenser's Faerie Queene* (Bryn Mawr College Monographs, 1910), pp. 24-26. As indicating the way in which MSS. were actually distributed in the sixteenth century among private owners (often in just such country houses as Spenser knew) see, for instance, the notes on the sixteenth century ownership of MSS. of the *Confessio*, in Macaulay, Vol. II, pp. cxxxix-xl, cxlii, cxlvii-viii, cl, clvii, clx-xi, and compare Karl Meyer, *John Gower's Beziehungen zu Chaucer*, etc., pp. 49-50, 58, 63.

Gower's *French* would certainly have offered to Spenser, who knew the French romances well, no greater obstacle than Chaucer's English.

astonished than I am myself at the results that have followed what began as a light-hearted and innocent excursion into the domain of the Seven Deadly Sins. I have given the facts as I found them, with what seems to me to be involved. If the parallels were with Ariosto or Tasso or Ovid, instead of with Gower, no one, I think, would hesitate for a moment to accept their obvious implications. And for my own part I can see no escape from the conclusions to which they point with reference to Spenser and Gower.

If, then, the contention of this paper is justified, it makes at least two contributions of some value. It discloses a new and wholly unsuspected literary relationship of uncommon interest and importance. And it throws fresh light on Spenser's craftsmanship. The bits from the *Mirour* and the *Confessio* are in all conscience "piecemeal gain." That Spenser in the first instance knew them for gold is significant enough. But even more illuminating is the "added artistry."

JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES.